# THE CHRISTIAN SAGA

NORMAN TOWAR BOGGS

11.8.32

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PRINCETON, N. J.

PURCHASED BY THE
MRS. ROBERT LENOX KENNEDY CHURCH HISTORY FUND.

BR 145 .B68 1931 v.2
Boggs, Norman Towar, 1882-
The Christian saga

# THE CHRISTIAN SAGA

## VOLUME TWO

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO · DALLAS
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
OF CANADA, LIMITED
TORONTO

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
NOV 8 1932
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

# THE
# CHRISTIAN SAGA

BY
NORMAN TOWAR BOGGS

*In Two Volumes*

VOLUME II

NEW YORK
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1931

COPYRIGHT, 1931,
BY NORMAN TOWAR BOGGS.

All rights reserved—no part of this book
may be reproduced in any form without
permission in writing from the publisher.

Set up and printed. Published November, 1931.

SET UP BY BROWN BROTHERS LINOTYPERS
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE FERRIS PRINTING COMPANY

# CONTENTS

## VOLUME II

## BOOK VII

## CHRISTENDOM DIVIDED

CHAPTER PAGE

XLI. Sixteenth century in art and politics. Politics and religion. Augustine and failure to realize imperial ideal. Reconstitution of religious basis of political authority. Humanism and Petrarch. Egotism and liberation of individuality. Printing. *Virtu.* Papacy and Renaissance. Vida's *Christiade.* Bible reading, and Erasmus . . . . . . . . . . . . 575

XLII. Germany at beginning of sixteenth century. Political complexities. Economic changes. Relation with Italy and Rome. Manuals of Piety and *The Bible of the Poor.* Influence on religion of printed books. Universities in Germany. The *Letters of Obscure Men.* The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. The Treasure of Merit and Indulgences . . . 597

XLIII. Religion and revolution. Luther's significance. His early life and conversion. The Righteousness of Faith, and its effect upon Luther. The theses against indulgences. Luther's program, and the medieval world . . . . . . . . . . . . . 617

XLIV. Effect of Luther's attack upon indulgences, and early steps of Reformation. Diet of Worms; Wartburg; radical outburst. Peasant's Revolt. Anabaptists. Luther's inflexibility and Marburg conference. Diet of Augsburg. Social effects of Reformation. Justification by faith and the divine right of kings . . 637

XLV. Fable of the Ox and Zwingli. Lutheran heresy enters France. Calvin's early life. His attachment to the Reform Movement. The *Institute of the Christian Religion.* Obedience and Doctrine of Election. The Geneva community. Calvin's modification of Lutheran impulse . . . . . . . . . . . 659

CHAPTER PAGE

XLVI. Reformation and Renaissance in France. The French temper in religion. Francis I and reformers. Henry II. The Guises. The conversion of the Condés and the conspiracy of Amboise. Beginning of religious war. Catherine de Medici; conciliatory attempts; Saint Bartholomew's. The Sacred Union. Henry of Navarre and the succession. The League and the *Satyre Ménippée.* Conversion of Henry IV and settlement of religious difficulties . . . . . . . 676

XLVII. Society and religion in England after War of Roses. The Oxford Reformers. The marriage of Catherine of Aragon. Henry VIII has a "secret matter" with the pope. Ascendancy of Anne Boleyn and divorce. King becomes head of Church. Dissolution of monasteries. Religious atmosphere; revolt in North. Reign of Edward. Mary Tudor and return to Catholicism. Elizabeth . . . . . . . . . 695

XLVIII. Character of English compromise and reform possibilities. Unity of worship. Development of religious changes. Non-conformity. The Book of Common Prayer. The Reformation in Scotland. Sabbath-keeping. The rule of the Kirk. Presbyterianism invades England. Influence of Book of Common Prayer . . . . . . . . . . . 717

## BOOK VIII

## THE INTRENCHMENT OF ROMAN CATHOLICISM

XLIX. Need of a new discipline. Spanish chivalry and Ignatius Loyola. His temperament and conversion. Foundation of the Company of Jesus. The *Spiritual Exercises* and the Constitution of the Company . 737

L. Demand for a General Council. Difficulties and delays. First assembly at Trent, and its adjournment. Second assembly; some doctrines defined; adjournment. Third assembly; Jesuit leadership. Decrees and policies. Expurgation and defense; medievalism and Council of Trent . . . . . . . . . . . 752

LI. Revival of Inquisition, in Spain particularly. Jews and Christians. The growth of persecution. Forced conversion and Jews in Spain. Inquisition and converted Jews. The Inquisition and Philip II. The Inquisition in the Netherlands . . . . . . . 768

CHAPTER PAGE

LII. The mystic liberation in Spain. Varied mystic currents. Establishment of the Mystic Way. The reformed Carmelites. Teresa of Jesus and her Autobiography. John of the Cross and the Dark Night. Pitfalls of the Mystic Way . . . . . . . . . . . 788

LIII. Italy and the Reformation. Old and new technique in reform. Jesuit activity in Germany. Effect of Thirty Years War. Jesuits and education. Activities in France. Gallicanism and the Concordat. Waning of Jesuit influence . . . . . . . . . . 805

## BOOK IX

## THE ORDERING OF DIVIDED CHRISTIANITY

LIV. Riding two horses in philosophy and religion. Cartesian basis of certainty. The machine of the Universe. Occasionalism. The *divine* harmony, after Spinoza and Leibnitz. Shifting of religious center . 825

LV. Divine right of kings in popular superstition and political theory. Decency and order. The smoothing of the Mystic Way: François de Sales. Speculative tolerance: Sir Thomas Browne. Hypocrisy. Humility and charity. Jeremy Taylor. Suavity slips on silks and satins . . . . . . . . . . . 840

LVI. Protestant creeds, sects, and controversies. Presbyterianism in England; rise of Independents. Conformity again; Satan and rebellion. John Bunyan and the lower class. Conversion and the Bible . . 859

LVII. Religion and abnormal psychology. Witchcraft consciousness. Witch cult and ceremonies. A successful exorcism. The case of Louis Gaufridy and Madeleine Demandolx. Puritanism and witchcraft . 875

LVIII. The atmosphere of calm. Jansenius, Pelagianism, and semi-pelagianism. Saint-Cyran, Mère Angélique and Port Royal. The persecution of Port Royal. Pascal; intellectual antecedents and conversion. Pascal's apologetic . . . . . . . . . . . . 892

## BOOK X

## SOLUTIONS AND DISSOLUTIONS OF RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY

LIX. Passing of the divinity of kings. The Deacon Paris. Reason in government, and in religion. Deism.

CHAPTER PAGE

Rousseau and the reaction of sentiment. Wesley. The Jesuits banned . . . . . . . . . . 913

LX. In France the revolutionaries take over the Church. Division and persecution. Robespierre's religion fails. Napoleon adopts the Church. His apology for religion. Chateaubriand's *Génie du Christianisme* . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 935

LXI. After Napoleon what? The growth of *indifference* in religion. Religion and the reinstating of absolute monarchs. Religion and the Romantic movement. Liberty. Goethe's *Faust* and the humanitarian ideal 951

LXII. Religion in new political rôle. Philosophical underpinning of new religious thought. Europe outlives Deism. Immanuel Kant. Religion and a new German state . . . . . . . . . . . . 964

LXIII. Luther and the Bible. Religion and the social order. Fichte and Schleiermacher. New aspirations of the lower classes. Religion and the salvation of the poor. Browning's *Pippa Passes* . . . . . . . 975

LXIV. Chickens come home to roost. The Bible and popular faith. New type of interest in history, and theories of *myths*. Biblical criticism. Disturbed fears for faith . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 992

LXV. The deed-value of faith, and Carlyle. Religion and the social goal. Saint-Simon and Auguste Comte. The philosophy of evolution. New doctrines of election and justification. Class consciousness in social reform, and awakening suspicion of Christianity . . 1009

LXVI. The saviors and the salvation of the nineteenth century. The authority of science. The status of organized Christianity, and its safeguarding. The Oxford Reform Movement. John Henry Newman . . . 1024

LXVII. Hopes and disillusions bred of Roman Catholicism. Rome at beginning of nineteenth century. Pius VII and Pius IX. The Roman Church takes its stand. The new popular appeal of Catholicism. A miracle in the Pyrenees . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1039

SOME CONCLUSIONS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1061

INDEX . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1073

# BOOK VII

# CHRISTENDOM DIVIDED

# XLI

Without strife or offensive aggression Mother Nature generates nothing.[1]

Nevertheless, since we possess freedom of will, it seems to me that we must recognize that chance does not to such an extent govern the world, but that human prudence plays some part in bringing about the things we see happen.[2]

THE sixteenth century, following upon a century become hectic with many decadent notes, was to be the most colorful of all the centuries of European history: disordered politically as a choppy sea in a changing wind, daring in thought and deed, bewildering in the energy and variety of its experiments, spectacular in its artistic achievements, as, in one country after another, imaginative geniuses in groups, like flights of liberated rockets, rose, flashed, and fell, to leave behind a shabby trail of mannered imitators, who paraded bizarre and ornate phantasies in the style known as the *baroque;* touching at and sensing the limits of the feasable, forcing fortune to the uttermost, *rusé* and opportunist, growing wary, weary, prudent—a stupendous and magnificent tragi-comedy, with a rather banal *dénouement.*

Underlying and mingled with its complexity this century saw religious revolutions in Germany and England, religious wars in France, a bitter and bloody religious-political struggle in which the Low Countries freed themselves from Catholic Spain, not to mention other movements of religious rebellion, revolution, repression and reform. It saw that decisive recasting of the medieval Church, which left it the Roman Catholic Church, with a long period of difficult readjustment of its traditions to an altered religious situation in Christendom.

---

[1] Quoted from Petrarch by Fernando de Rojas, in the Prologue to his *La Celastina.*

[2] Machiavelli, *The Prince,* chap. xxv.

We are about to leave, more abruptly than the facts altogether warrant, the Middle Ages behind us. Yet this we should not do without being prepared still to find religion for long of underlying importance in political Europe. Europe was to witness quite as much political as religious revolution during the sixteenth century, and religious revolution and rebellion may often seem, as we proceed, quite as much political as any other one thing. For the sixteenth century had no intention, save perhaps in the thought of some few thinkers such as Machiavelli,[3] of leaving religion behind, as the basis of political sovereignty and the authority of the state. Rather, after some violent gestures of independence toward old accepted political doctrines, Europe was for a time to settle under some equally religious, and equally dogmatic new ones. Consequently religion played a rôle of prime importance in the general institutional revolution, which was to make the political atmosphere of the seventeenth century so conspicuously different from that of the fifteenth; and we may perhaps better understand this change by turning back for a moment to Augustine.

In Augustine's conception, we recall, man's earthly existence, and the earth itself, had the single substantial purpose of collecting the chosen citizens of God's eternal kingdom. Mankind was divided into two *cities,* composed of those who were, and those who were not, destined for this eternal citizenship. But a new European world, built around Christianity, pushed what Augustine had called the Terrestrial City outside the nominally converted portion of Europe, and the Church gathered to itself, in theory, all institutions and activities within the Christianized area. So arose the ideal of Christendom; an earthly city of God, to become identical in citizenry and purpose with the organized Church.

Christendom was thus not only a religious but a political entity, in ideal, which dream was fortified by the continuing memory of

---

[3] Machiavelli has something to say as to the influence of religion in politics, in a chapter of *The Prince* upon "Ecclesiastical States" (chap. xi), which seems to suggest with a certain irony the rôle later to be assigned religion in European politics.

Rome's ancient imperial dominion; and it would seem that whoever was responsible for the forgery of the so-called Donation of Constantine imagined the pope as head of this empire. To such a hope the rise of the Carolingians was a blow, and the crowning of Charlemagne substituted another hope, according to which there was to be an emperor also in Christendom, whose imperial crown was to be conferred upon him by the pope. Then this modified hope fell afoul of an inevitable struggle between pope and emperor, as to the relative dominance or independence of their respective powers. Both pope and emperor fell afoul of the feudal system, which might honor them as an aspiration, but left no substantial basis upon which their claims might be made good practically. But here the pope, as a religious personage, had much the better of it, and the medieval ideal of the papacy came far nearer a momentary realization than that of the Empire ever did. With Frederick II, who died in 1250, the last great emperor of medieval aspiration disappeared,[4] and before that century closed the ideal became a largely speculative dream, which Dante's fancy, turning in disgust from the weakness and abuses of papal power, might apply more narrowly, as a cure for the political difficulties of Italy, rather than of the whole of Europe.[5] Meanwhile the empire, as an existing institution, underwent a gradual change, that left a sharp contrast between the still continued external and ceremonial forms pretending sovereign power, and the actual constitution of that power, even in Germany, to which portion of Europe, with Italy, the imperial ideal had long since been confined.[6] Distinguished by the most pompous titles, accompanied and served upon ceremonial occasions by the great Germanic princes, in title officers of his household, the emperor still made pretension to the rights of his predecessors. At the same time he had come to possess, before the century of the Reformation opened, by sole virtue of the imperial title, no feudal domains, and no revenues save what he might screw out of these princes, upon whom his power rested. Only as head of some great feudal house might he possess lands and revenues appropriate to his dignities, and the "princes and states of the empire were subjects in name only." [7] Meanwhile political theorizing, which grew from the fourteenth century, did nothing to mend the authority of the emperor, save in establishing for him a religious basis of sovereignty independent of the papacy; but this same thing it tended to do for all reigning princes alike.

---

[4] Pernice, *Gli Imperi del Medio Evo,* 423; also Robertson, *Charles V,* introd. chap.

[5] Dante, *De Monarchia.*

[6] Not, of course, the Germany of to-day, but the older Germanic portion of Europe.

At the same time nationalities were consolidating, parceled feudal loyalties weakening. Then came a wave of political speculation changing altogether the relation between religion and the state; which reflected upon ancient history, to conclude that religious ceremonies, even though not Christian, were useful to a state to keep it from becoming corrupt,[8] but which, however, claimed no divine basis of sovereignty, but rather advised princes, or those who aspired so to be, how to obtain and maintain power which might fall or had, in one way or another, fallen into their hands.[9] This new philosophy was formulated by one himself in theory a democrat, and by temperament an opportunist. It might be, and was to prove, useful to hereditary princes, but it might also inspire strong-arm revolutionary methods.

Here it was that religion entered into the political movements of the sixteenth century. Nationalities, or political states, were, by this new philosophy, taken to be groups of citizenry with common customs, habits, interests, and traditions, which moved them as masses, and by the wise utilization of which these masses might be controlled. All very well so far for the princes, for whom this philosophy had been written; but there was also the question of safeguarding the use of sovereign power by princes. The religious-political unity of Christendom had passed beyond even the sphere of dreaming. Religion was to enter in a new political rôle into the history of Europe, on the one side in an attempt to control the arbitrary use of power by princes, in making them the servants of God, on the other in stabilizing political states, by establishing each state separately upon some sort of divine basis.

---

[7] Robertson, *Charles V,* introd. review, sec. ii.

[8] Machiavelli, *Discorsi sopra le Prima Deca de Tito Livio,* book i, chaps. xi-xiv.

[9] Machiavelli, *The Prince.*

But, together with this movement, which was to carry Europe over from the medieval political régime to that of absolute monarchies, there was a revolution in the realm of religion itself. The medieval ideal assumed one settled and unquestioned religion for all of Christendom. Soon there were several, three of marked distinction, and of different political emphasis. And each religion expected princes to preserve and enforce that particular religion. Luther intrusts the preservation of religion to the Lutheran princes of the German nation. Calvin dedicates his *Institute of the Christian Religion* to his king, Francis I, suggesting that the maintenance of the glory of God upon earth, and the establishment in its entirety and strength of the reign of Christ, were matters worthy of royal care, and that he who did not "reign with the purpose of serving the glory of God" exercised, not a legitimate dominion, but a "tyranny and a brigandage." So too, in effect, from a third angle, the Jesuits were to teach. And consequently any religious group, feeling itself in possession of *the sole* Christian truth, felt bound to regiment society accordingly, founding a new *City of God,* universal, at least in its inherent aspiration.

For this reason, among others, the period of the Reformation was to be also a period of political warfare, and for this reason, whatever were the others, this warfare was likely to be the more bitter and bloody, proportionately as religion was mixed up with it. Religion was to remain, and long to remain, an instrument of rule, whether the rule were that of religious or secular potentates; and whatever new freedom the Christian might attain, as a result of a religious revolution intended in a sense to free religious life, was long to remain an *inward* affair, that left little latitude in the matter of uttered word, open act, or public worship. So far as the sixteenth century was concerned, toleration of religious differences among individual political groups was hardly to be an issue. Sebastian Franck, the German free-thinker, soon remarked that there was less freedom of speech and belief among Lutherans than among Turks and heathen, and neither Calvinists nor Jesuits intended any larger religious toleration.

In short then, the religious movements of the sixteenth century were not long allowed to remain disruptive of set religious patterns which might aspire to draw men closer together in some political pattern. After several decades of sharp clash, the attempt was to be made, even more definite than previously, to erect religion as the stabilizer of political sovereignty, and the securer of social order. But this new political sovereignty was not to be the old political sovereignty, this new social order was not to be the old social order, and the religious attitude in which men were again to be bound together was to be by no means the old religious attitude. The disruption which religion was soon given the task of reducing to order had done a work of grave and fundamental import for the entire social life of Europe, and for the human attitude of its citizenry, to which we must turn our attention.

The disruptive forces, so potent everywhere in the sixteenth century, and often energized most effectively when linked with religious reform, were of no single source. The old order had been long on the decline. Economic maladjustment was becoming more and more evident, inciting defensive actions that made old institutions more tyrannical and oppressive than ever before. New economic and social potencies were forming and gaining strength. But all the resulting sea of turmoil was largely blind, for the very reason that the Middle Ages could not look clearly beyond their own boundaries, and view their civilization in the light of some other of very different premises.

It was a renewed interest in ancient civilization, and its ideals, growing first among a few scholars, which slowly and gradually turned the vision of the Middle Ages out of its own boundaries, and then back again to judge its institutions. Late in the fourteenth century arose a movement which the learned call humanism, which movement was an interest in the literature, thought, and civilization of the ancient world; and it was these *humanists* who first discovered that there was a *medieval civilization,* and gave it a name. From this time on the medieval institutional complex might not be looked upon naïvely as the world-order erected and maintained by God for countless ages. So it had been conceived. The Middle Ages knew no such thing as what we call *anachronisms.* Jews, for example, of the time of Jesus, might be marked as such in art by characteristics of their clothing, or even by the sign of infamy they wore, in the medieval period. But now, as more intimate knowledge of a different sort of life arose, a new element of instability was added to the destructive forces at work in the medieval world.

The Middle Ages had never lost the memory of a preceding ancient world. Some of its personalities still lived in Christian legend, the tradition of its persecutions was preserved in the tales of the saints and martyrs, Constantine and Charlemagne in a sense fused as the symbol about which gathered the ideal of the Christian empire. But this ancient world was far more an affair of legend in the thirteenth century than it had been six or seven centuries earlier. The scholastics dug up some work of Plato, and in the end even more of Aristotle, but this they did to use some of their conceptions as dislocated tools, in an entirely different context, into which the tools carried no suggestions as to a different manner of envisaging life as a whole. But further curiosity, for a broader and more intimate knowledge of how people lived and thought in days when Plato and Aristotle lived, was always a possibility lurking both in the legendary memory, and in the one-sided and partial knowledge of this older world. Also, before the doubt, mounting sometimes to disgust, bred of the more and more apparent dissolution of the most respected institutions of the medieval world, the desire to revive this different past might offer a ready and convenient retreat. So humanism, the term coined to define this more sympathetic attitude toward the ancient world out of which grew the Renaissance, was of double parentage, as any respectable infant should be. It was both a reaching out and a looking back. But these two elements, at bottom incompatible, were not clearly displayed in the early scholarly and literary enthusiasm.

This early enthusiasm owed its initial impetus, in an unusual degree, to the interest and effort of a single man, Francis Petrarch. As a symptom of the mid-fourteenth century, in which Petrarch lived, it is worth noting that his father planned to make him a lawyer, a profession of rising importance; that he personally chose the career of *belles-lettres* (the term is out of fashion, but fits Petrarch excellently); and that he should have practiced both careers in the orders of Christian priest, who wrote love poems, and raised two children for a pope to legitimatize; that further, he found employment for a considerable time in the papal court at Avignon.

As a humanist, Petrarch was an avid searcher after manuscripts of the classic age, the collector of the first important private library in post-classic times. He was a zealous imitator of the polished Latin style of Cicero and Virgil. He studied and practiced literary style as an art, wrote suavely melodious verses in the vernacular tongue. He attained, in a pedantic revival of ancient fashion, a laurel crown, for the gaining which he intrigued, and in wearing which he wielded with zest the monarch's scepter of a new Parnassus.

But, for the fortunes of Christianity in Europe, he possessed something of more importance: a spirit stranger to the Middle Ages. This was the spirit of self-conscious self-cultivation, which in Petrarch's particular accent might be called the *æsthetic attitude.* Petrarch was no doctor in the medieval sense. In learning he was superficial; literary rather than professional. He established himself, not as a teacher, but as a fastidious personal reactor. In this attitude he let pass before him in criticism, and in the rôle of an elegant though always serious connoisseur, not only such intellectual riffraff as astrology, alchemy, and dream-book prophecy, but also the contemporary practice of law and medicine, the methods and interests of scholastic philosophy, the changing tides of statesmanship and politics. Consciously he pruned, and preened, and plumed his individuality, developing his taste—as self-consciously almost as Goethe after him. Again, as Goethe, he rejoiced in exercising a dictatorship in the world of polite letters growing up about him. The century-long anonymity of the medieval artist, which has left so many masterpieces wrought by unknown hands, was lost in him. *John Smith* came into his own, not merely, as elsewhere indicated, an *individual* before his Creator and Judge, but as himself creator and judge.

As the sixteenth century approached, in Italy particularly, self-preoccupation, and the desire of self-advertisement entered more and more into the psychology that shaped affairs. Castiglione, in his book upon the ideal gentleman (*Il Cortegiano*) introduces quite an argument as to how, and to what an extent a gentleman might praise himself. "I have known," says one character in this dialogue, "few men excelling in any sort of thing, who did not praise themselves." [10] Machiavelli, beginning his *History of Florence* at much the same time, complains that his predecessors, in writing history, had neglected to note how important had been the rôle played by personal vanity, so that some, unable to attract notice for praiseworthy acts, strove to do so by means of acts conspicuously scandalous.[11] This egotism, in a sometimes brazen form, is most commonly known in the *Autobiography of Benevenuto Cellini."* [12]

Such egotism, defended as a legitimate means of not being "defrauded of that honor which is the true reward of courageous deeds,[13] was definitely antipathetic to the human ideal that had become traditional in Christian thought. For centuries the egocentric interest of strenuous Christians had been exercised in mortifying vanity and fleshly instincts. The ideal of Benedict centered in humility, and this ideal not only rooted in the cloister, but became the pattern of manners in the world. It became more and more serviceable to ecclesiastical authority, and thus there was excellent reason for continuing to commend it to Christians; and if it subtly changed from active disciplinary efforts to *convert* the will (in Benedict's phrase) to an abject passivity before ecclesiastical authority, it was not in this form less serviceable to interests of the Church. But now came a reaction, and human individuality strutted for a season, displayed itself at times even to the point of the ridiculous.

---

[10] *Il Cortegiano,* I, xviii.

[11] See Burchardt, *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien,* Part II entire; Villari, *Life and Times of Machiavelli,* II, 90-91 (in Eng. trans.).

[12] "I went on working at my book, and when I finished it I took it to the pope, who was in good truth unable to refrain from commending it greatly"—faintly mild for Cellini.

[13] "E forza è che qualche modo lo scuopra, per non essere defraudato dell' onore, che è il vero premio delle virtuose fatiche" (Cortigiano, I, xviii).

This change of human attitude was not based merely upon the revival of interest in antiquity which fed it. In Italy wealth arose more by trade than industry disturbing old class distinctions. Here feudal power had been early broken, and the political fortunes of Italian states were troubled by rival claims of non-Italian powers, not seldom called in by the papacy for help in preserving its temporalities. Cities, which had been at times tossed from one rule to another, enjoying interims of political independence, had developed burning local patriotism, and the mastery of these cities began to fall to the lot of rich merchant-bankers, and of energetic soldiers of fortune (*condottieri*) with mercenary armies at their back, who outgrew the ambition of fighting battles for others, for pay and plunder, and undertook to carve out states for themselves. So new were these states, so lacking in hallowed tradition the family line of the founders, that they might hardly be ascribed to divine foundation. In France, when the heir to the throne married the daughter of a rich banker prince (Henry II and Catherine de Medici) the old aristocracy might look upon her as an outsider,[14] but in Italy people began to question the matter of birth as the natural basis of princely virtue and of military prowess. "Nature by no means makes such fine distinctions. Often the highest natural gifts are seen among persons of the lowest birth." [15]

The adventurer flourished, if he possessed a grace that charmed everyone at the first encounter (*che lo faccia al primo aspetto a chiunque lo vede grato ed amabile*).[16] Every monk carried a car-

[14] When Cæsar Borgia, the hero of Machiavelli's *Prince,* came to France in 1498, to wed a French princess, the sister of the King of Navarre, the French king, Louis XII, who had previously made him a duke, remarked sarcastically of his sumptuous train, "Voila bien du luxe pour un petit duc de Valentinois."

[15] *Il Cortigiano,* I, xv.

[16] *Ibid.*

dinal's hat in his alms-bag, every poetaster who could turn a sonnet dreamed of the laurel crown, every adventurer might aspire to carve out a principality." [17] As for the mass, those who rose above them considered them as rather fatuous tools, the slaves of their stupidity, and their short-sighted greed.

> Men are, it must be said, in general ungrateful, fickle, deceitful, cowardly, greedy of gain. No sooner have you done them a good turn than they are at your disposal entirely, ready to offer you their property, blood, life, even their children.

Naturally no one who thought of himself at all, in the terms of these conceptions, thought of himself as of this flaccid stupid mass, but rather as among those who might intelligently exploit its flabby changeable spirit and its greedy delusions.

All of the liberated energy, to be sure, did not go toward attempts to rise with unbridled egoism upon the backs of a brutalized mass. It once having been discovered that states and principalities were not creations of God, but rather agglomerations of human beings which could be arranged and swayed by a masterful will, some imaginations began to busy themselves with idealistic social schemes for human betterment. The frames of Utopias were set on paper, into which the extravagance of hope, and all the disillusion with the real as well, both entered. In one such Utopian plan of a community, drawn up in Germany during the Peasant's Revolt, it was set down that, in this ideal commonwealth, *all* children should be taught Latin, Greek, Hebrew, medicine, and astronomy. When the mind began to soar toward freedom, learning, beauty, or truth, there seemed no barrier anywhere. It was a glorious thing to feel oneself so free. An Italian humanist, Pico della Mirandola, offered, in one comprehensive challenge, to defend nine hundred theses he had drawn up.

At the same time that human self-consciousness and self-confidence became violently articulate and active, the scope of possible human experience broadened with rapid strides. In the third quarter of the fifteenth century spread the invention of printing.

---

[17] Von Gleichen-Russwurm, *op. cit.,* 30.

Presses were set up so rapidly that, from the period 1462-1500 the names of more than a thousand presses have been preserved.

> As the apostles of Christ went of old throughout the world announcing the good-tidings, so in our day the disciples of the sacred art spread through all countries, and their books are like heralds of the Gospel, and preachers of truth and science.[18]

So writes a contemporary. Then immediately came the era of exploration. The Azores, Madeira, the western and eastern coasts of Africa, the upper reaches of the Nile, were discovered, rediscovered, or explored. The southernmost cape of Africa was rounded on a voyage to the East, of the riches of which a gold-hungry Europe dreamed. Then the New World of America was discovered, and ransacked. Those who could not go long journeys to unknown worlds were soon reading about them. Life became, for the imagination if not more intimately, an adventure into the unknown.

For the artist, or the creative imagination, it became an era almost unequaled. Not only were such, more than others, inflamed imaginatively, but they won generous patronage. A man of letters became almost certainly a statesman; a poet, painter, sculptor or architect, the companion of the princes and the great.

The clash and struggle involved in this world of liberated energy and imagination, employed with unquestioned egoism and often ruthlessly, by a masterful few who more usually were contemptuous of the mass, was erected as the natural law of creation. We have quoted a passage to that effect at the head of the chapter, drawn from the prologue of a Spanish romance of lust, intrigue, greed, revenge and sorcery. This situation had no laws, save such delicate and fluid principles as arose from no single system or conception, but from cool observation of human motives, and which could only be successfully applied by one sensitive to the changing currents of circumstance. "Princes who govern their conduct according to the times are rarely unfortunate, and Fortune does not change for those who know how to adapt themselves to their time."[19] This was the prudence which, grace to the freedom of the will, might play a part with chance in governing the things which happened, as suggested in the second quoted passage at the head of this chapter.

---

[18] Wimpheling, *De Arte Impressoria.*

Such were the modest limits of freedom, as they appeared to keen observers of the fate of those who rode the crest of the wave. Guicciardini, a far less mercurial personality than Machiavelli, reflects that the whole substructure of human affairs was as unstable "as a sea disturbed by the wind."[20] The brilliance of the period hides from us, as it by no means hid it from those who lived through it, the destructive elements of this unleased egoism which, while it played the hero or flitted in the realm of the beautiful and poetic, was often conscious of how it sat upon a powder keg, between a sewer and a slaughterhouse. The gentle poet Ariosto, who loved flowers, woods and fairy stories, among which his imagination lived, also lived with the knowledge that his father was a paid poisoner, and wrote complimentary verses to a cardinal who had hired thugs to dig out the eyes of a brother who was his rival for the love of a lady. Indeed, even the art of the age, despite its brilliance, was of unstable foundation. It faced, as the whole Renaissance, two incompatible ways: back to antiquity, forward in daring experiment. Virtuosity alone held its disparate elements together. "No sooner did the creative force of art slacken with the national decadence (in Italy) than the diversity of its primitive elements began to reappear."[21]

Italy lived through, in less than a century, in violent and dramatic symbol the experiments and enthusiasms of this bewildering liberation, somewhat as, three centuries later, France was to symbolize the course of events turned loose by the conceptions which bred the French Revolution. Here life became in a measure delirious. It indeed bred a madness which swept, something as flagellation in the fourteenth and witchcraft in the seventeenth centuries, over large social groups. In Italy they called this social epidemic the fever *mazuco*. This *mazuco* appears to have been a nervous disorder, which caused spasmodic movements, incited dancing as a relief, which dancing became contagious in the generally excited atmosphere. One of the inflicted seized in the public streets, others joined hands with him, until all together in a ring took to dancing wildly. The riches which rolled in to such a family as that of the Medici in Florence, gained in trade with Egypt and the East, might adorn the city, but it did not spread far in relieving needs of everybody. The population was divided between the "fat and the lean" (*il populo grasso e il populo minuto*). Poverty no longer might remain a religious ideal, since poverty no longer meant the rejection of superfluity, but going hungry. Moreover the lean might become suddenly fat, the fat not less suddenly lean, so much did life depend upon the favor of the great; and so much too the fortunes of the great upon factors they might not control.

---

[19] *The Prince,* chap. xxv.

[20] *Storia d'Italia,* I, i.

[21] Villari, *Life and Times of Machiavelli,* I, 388.

And if we ask what it was that was prescribed as life-preserver in this troubled sea, we may turn to Machiavelli for the answer. Someone suggests that, while Machiavelli never himself had been afflicted with the *mazuco,* he had felt its breath.[22] The life-preserving quality he called *virtu.* It was, however, neither the *virtus* (or *arete*) of ancient Greece or Rome, nor the *virtue* later made by Puritans synonymous with the chastity of women. It was a disposition, rather, that might look on, while the temporarily deranged victims of the *mazuco* danced in their maniac rings, and which might learn to employ this madness of theirs profitably for oneself. *Virtu* was the sixteenth-century formula of success, which meant the intelligent choice of means for accomplishing one's ends, and the courageous use of those means, whether kindness or cruelty, presents of golden cups or poisoned peaches, without fear or flinching at the use of any tool whatsoever that might serve the moment's exigency.[23] The prescription was intended for princes, and for a hundred years no ambitious prince failed to take counsel of Machiavelli's *Prince.* Needless to say such a separation between political and private morality was not universally observed. Already in the sixteenth century Francis Bacon perceived the spread of this formula: "We should be grateful to Machiavelli and those of his school; pretending to give lessons to princes, they have given them to peoples."

---

[22] Introduction to French translation of *The Prince* in ed. Garnier.

[23] The title of a chapter in Machiavelli's *Discorsi* . . . is interesting here. It reads (book II, chap. xiii), "Che si viene dà bassa a gran fortuna piu con la fraude che con la forze." (One is more likely to rise from humble to mighty station position with fraud than by force (or strength)).

Despite a natural desire to lose nothing that had been gained by the very different human attitude of the Middle Ages, the papal court early became an important center of the new humanism, and its broader Renaissance, with all the brilliance of art and literature it brought with it. Humanists, painters, poets, sculptors, architects, found among popes and cardinals employment and generous patronage. Nicholas V, Alexander VI, Julius II, Leo X, Clement VII, fill out together a strange and many-sided picture of the Renaissance at Rome. Among them one finds the fresh enthusiasm for the new learning, the not less enthusiastic welcome of liberated vices, the *virtu* of the *condottieri,* opulent magnificence joined with a grace which had lost the fiber of firmness, complex, and sometimes weak and frantic twists and turns among a maze of political intrigue.

But, underneath the surface, there were deep incongruities between the pretensions, and also the permanent interests of the papacy, and this new spirit. It was here bound to be, and soon to display itself as nothing deeper than a new veneer soon to be rubbed away. This incongruity might for a time display itself in brilliant forms, which obscured almost completely the false note underlying. Painters might create new types, in pictures of religious subject. Perugino's *Virgin* was hardly the Church's saintly protectress of all ranks of Christendom, but she still had her own loveliness and appeal. Da Vinci's *John the Baptist* was perhaps no more of a psychological puzzle than ascetic saints had often been, but he was hardly an object for naïve veneration. But when we pass from painting to poetry claiming inspiration from Christian story, in the broad reach of an epic poem, written upon the subject of the gospel narrative, the *Christiade* of the poet-prelate

Vida, the incongruity, of which one may lose sight beneath the dome of St. Peter's, becomes almost ridiculously evident.

> Cedite romani scriptores—cedite graeci;
> Hic scio quid nascitur Eneide.

In these words the pope, Leo X, hailed Vida's *Christiade.* Roman and Greek poets had been outdone—Lo! a greater Æneid had come to birth. It is worth a moment of our time to see something of how the Gospel story might be arranged to fit the fashion of a papal court of the sixteenth century, with heaven a palace of solid gold, set with sparkling jewels, and set upon *the summit of Mount Olympus.* One incident will serve; the simple moving scene of that last supper, in which Jesus, with his disciples in a little "upper chamber" celebrated the Passover before his arrest.

In Vida's poem, Jesus sends off some of his disciples to inquire for a particular house, and to ask there that the proprietor put at their disposal a *little room,* in which he and his followers may celebrate the feast. In this case Jesus' request for a *little room* has much of the irony of Renaissance popes, still singing themselves the *servant of the servants of Christ;* for Jesus himself suggests that what they will be shown is not precisely a modest chamber. But the reality even outdoes his suggestion. They are first ushered into a splendid palace. Fires are immediately built to heat it for their reception, fed with wood which, in burning, gave off the odor of rare incense. Then the dining hall is thrown open for their inspection and approval as the *little room* desired. Its ceiling is resplendent with painted figures. Its walls are hung with tapestries and purple. The floor is resplendently tiled. Couches rest upon ivory feet, and are garnished with silver and with gold.[24] Here Jesus, with the ex-fishermen Peter, James, and John, and the others, are to recline while their repast is served. Indeed Leo X himself might have deigned to eat there with his favorites.

We need not follow farther the hybrid pomposities of this so very Virgilian epic. Its author has truly caught much of the rhythm of Virgil's verse, has hardly missed a trick of his style or structural method, in composing what to-day reveals to us as an absurdity—an absurdity lauded by the polished and cultivated pontiff, Leo X. Need one wonder that there were other and more tangible incongruities in such papal atmosphere? It was not only poets and painters who found patrons here. Soldiers of fortune, assassins, poisoners were not always unwelcome, since the papacy too must possess *virtu,* in this time of daring deeds, and, so far as material means of defense were concerned the pope, as a monarch, was weaker often than some other Italian princes. So too, at the papal court, every vice liberated in this orgy of new freedom was at times practiced, and hardly less openly than elsewhere. And, to make the picture more hideous, these popes who lived several of them much like other contemporary princes, could not in a moment be stripped of all the accumulated superstitious awe with which tradition had come to surround the Vicar of Christ. He sold men pardon for their sins, somewhat equivocally, and thousands bought of him, attending not at all to subtle equivocations and qualifications. He sold at times every favor, in this world or the next, with the power of dispensing which long centuries had gradually endowed him. Secular princes, who in their political activities treated him much as any other ruler, snatching his provinces in favorable moments, sacking his capital; at other times kissed his feet, feeling in need of some spiritual blessing he was believed empowered to grant, with a fear and feelings which, no doubt, were far from wholly cynical.

---

[24] *Christiados,* book ii.

Humanism and the Renaissance came first to Italy. In Italy also the new life and attitude was closest to the civilization which had originally given it birth. Here also, because it came there first perhaps, the new enthusiasm tried out its experimental excesses, and was most pagan. A century and a half after Petrarch's death, western Europe, Italy excepted, was still superficially medieval, "thinking ideas which it had ceased to believe, and using a learned tongue it can hardly be said to understand."[25] Underneath the surface, however, the changes which we have suggested

[25] A. M. Fairbairn, *Cambridge Modern History,* II, 690.

above were at work, particularly in Germany; and humanism crossed the Alps, not so much to introduce new interest in pagan ideas, as to inspire a new interest in the original sources of Christian tradition.

Translations and paraphrases of parts of the Bible into tongues spoken by the people were not altogether strange to the Middle Ages. In the British Isles they had gone back to the time of Cædmon and Bede, in the seventh and eighth centuries. But, with the spread of heresy in the twelfth century Bible reading began to be a dangerous occupation for Christians. In 1199 Waldensians in Metz were found to possess translations of the New and parts of the Old Testament. The pope, not feeling justified in directly condemning Bible reading, advised that the Scriptures were over the heads of the uneducated, and admonished the laity to refrain from the dangerous practice. In 1226 a Spanish prince forbade Bible reading in the vernacular in his realm, and all such books found were burned. At the end of the fourteenth century a relatively complete Bible translation became an element in the Wycliffe movement, and from there the habit of Bible reading passed to the Bohemian followers of John Huss.

The invention of printing, in Germany particularly, made the discouragement of Bible reading far more difficult, and before the Protestant schism not less than fourteen editions in the High German, and five in the Low German dialect appeared. The faithful might even be advised to read, having first demanded the illumination of the Holy Spirit. Thence, since the Holy Spirit's assistance could not be considered complete or infallible, as its promptings were in a still inward voice easily confused with Satan's whisperings, there was a still surer source of illumination in difficult passages:

> Whatever you do not understand in the Holy Scriptures, pass it over and confide its interpretation to the Church. The Church interprets all with truth, and it alone has the power to do so.[26]

Such translations as Europe had were based upon the Vulgate, the authorized and official version (in Latin) of the Church. But, among the popular results of humanism in Italy had been a desire to know the Greek tongue, a knowledge rarer, even in the universities of the later medieval period, than among the learned of Charlemagne's time. Even Petrarch, after an unsuccessful attempt, gave up the task of mastering Greek, although he proudly possessed some Greek manuscripts. Others later were more successful. Lorenzo Vallo, who died in the middle of the fifteenth century, had gone sufficiently far in his Greek studies to examine several important documents critically, with sensational results. He concluded that the Vulgate was not only faulty in Latin style, but incorrect often in rendering the Greek text. He concluded that the so-called *Donation* of Constantine was not only not genuine, but absurd,[27] and suggested that it might have been fabricated at the Curia.[28] Further, submitting the so-called Apostle's Creed (or symbol) to examination in the light of what he had learned as to the apostolic age, he pointed out terms and clauses which could not possibly be of that period.

---

[26] Quoted from a contemporary tract by Jannsen, *L'Allemagne et la Réforme,* I, 48.

Valla, like Petrarch a priest, was an elegant scholar, and a defender of Epicureanism in a sense sufficiently licentious to be popular. His critical studies had no immediate influence of importance, and he ended his days in Rome, protected by two popes of humanistic sympathies.[29] It was two generations later that both Luther and Calvin praised him.

Early in the sixteenth century arose a humanist north of the Alps, Erasmus. Less a stylist and grammarian than a social satirist, an intellectual to that point where his detachment led him in the end to serve neither Protestants nor Catholics, he used his humanism, not to paganize society, but rather as background and balance, to define and counterbalance his vision of Christian life as he saw it about him; and he used his philosophy to distill, from words of Jesus and ancient thinkers both, an undogmatic religion and an ethical piety. Incidentally, with the assistance of the new art of printing, he became the first *popular writer* of modern times.[30]

---

[27] "Non modum falsum verum etiam stolidum."

[28] "Nam aliquot saeculis, aut non intellexerunt Donationem Constantini commentitiam fictamque esse, aut ipsi finxerunt, sive posteriores in majorum suorum dolis vestigia imprimentes pro vera quam falsam cognescerent defenderunt." Valla was a master of invective and minced few words.

[29] His more particular papal patron, Nicholas V, encouraged the making of a new Latin version, begun by a competent scholar, but never finished.

Erasmus found, in an abbey near Louvain, still unprinted, Valla's *Notes on the New Testament.* At no small personal risk he published the manuscript. Also his own studies led him to discover, not only like Valla before him the inaccuracy of the Vulgate, but the uncertainty surrounding this text, of which there was no standard version, and many variations in different manuscripts and printed copies. He himself began, and rather hastily finished, a new Latin version of the New Testament, not actually published until after a more important work of his appeared, a Greek text, first in 1516, with four revisions and some sixty-nine reprints before 1536. This first published Greek text of the New Testament had its errors, but, with the new Latin version, it was able to call attention to Vulgate corruptions with definite bearing upon religious customs under criticism. An altered translation of a single word, in the passage, "And in those days cometh John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judæa, saying *change the disposition of your minds,* for the kingdom of the heavens has drawn near," is said so powerfully to have influenced Luther as to affect the whole course of the Reformation.[31]

All the inspiration humanism won from books, all the enthusiasm aroused for them in the popular mind by the invention of printing, all the testimony found in the Bible to fortify widespread criticism of abuses in the Church, worked together to erect in Christendom a new seat of final authority in religion: the Holy Scriptures. To resort as final authority to a collection of writings so extensive, complicated, and contradictory as the books of the Bible was a less simple matter than for the moment anyone suspected, and a contemporary printer, had he possessed the technique of modern advertising, might have advertised his edition of the Bible in some such words as these—"Here, within the covers of this book, printed in convenient size, is to be found everything necessary to your salvation, in this world and the next."

---

[30] Of *The Praise of Folly* of Erasmus more than twenty thousand copies were sold in about eleven years. Of his *Colloquies* there were one hundred impressions during his life time. Save for the Bible in various tongues no contemporary work had nearly so large a scale.

[31] The word translated *repent* in English versions, the Vulgate so translated as to make it mean either *repent,* or the possibly different thing, *do penance.* Erasmus' change was a paraphrase something as the italicized words above.

Substantial salvation, a confident assurance of having found a comforting, comprehensive, and permanent foothold among the perplexing changes and chances of human existence is never so simple a thing as that. But human conscientiousness chooses, not among absolutes, but between alternatives. Stripped to logic, the pope was a simpler repository of final authority. But the alternative for the general mass, not yet, like Newman after three centuries of Protestant experience frightened to repose in it, was not logic. It was rather that Erasmuc portrays in one of his *Colloquies:*

> If you look into Christians in common, don't you find they live as if the whole sum of religion consisted in ceremonies? With how much pomp are the ancient rites of the Church set forth in Baptism? The infant waits without the Church door, the exorcism is performed, the catechising is performed, vows are made, Satan is abjured, with all his pomps and pleasures; then the child is anointed, signed, seasoned with salt, dipped, a charge given to sureties (sponsors) to see it well brought up; and the oblation money being paid, they are discharged, and by this time the child passes for a Christian, and in some sense is so. A little time after it is anointed again, and in time learns to confess, receives the Sacrament, is accustomed to rest on holy days, to hear divine service, to fast sometimes, to abstain from flesh; and if he observes all these he passes for an absolute Christian. He marries a wife, and then comes on another sacrament; he enters holy orders, is anointed again, and consecrated, his habit is changed, and then to prayers. . . . The greatest part of men in the world trust to these things, and think they have nothing else to do, but get wealth by right or wrong, to gratify their passions of rage, lust, malice, ambition: and this they do till they come to their death bed; and then there follows more ceremonies; confession upon confession, more unction still, the Eucharist is administered, tapers, the Cross, holy water are brought in; indulgences are procured, if they are to be had for love or money; orders are given for a magnificent funeral; and then comes on another solemn contract: when the man is in agony of death, there one stands by, bawling in his ear, and now and

> then dispatches him before his time, if he chance to be a little in drink, or have better lungs than ordinary. Now, although these things may be well enough . . . yet there are some more internal impressions, which have an efficacy to fortify us against the assaults of death, by filling our hearts with joy, and helping us go out of the world with a Christian assurance.[32]

Certainly, on the eve of the Reformation, life had become a less simple and more risky affair from the religious standpoint. Human individuality had attained, for better or worse, new precepts of freedom and broader opportunities of personal choice, involving many new moral problems. Religious authority, without which humanity had by no means glimpsed the possibility of living, had developed two poles, toward which the lines of attractions by no means traveled parallel.

---

[32] Erasmus, *Familiar Colloquies,* in the dialogue entitled "The Religious Treat" (trans. N. Bailey, ed. 1900, I, 196-197).

## XLII

There is no nation more despised than the Germans. Italians call us brutes, French and Spaniards ridicule us, and so do all other lands. Who can guess what God intends, and will succeed in making of Germans finally, who have indeed well earned of him a good thrashing.[1]

Here in Germany Wisdom has her dwelling. Pious; certainly piety in superlative degree is the genius of this people.[2]

IN the sixteenth century, Germany still remained to a degree a country aside from the currents of European civilization, into which drifted, from various directions, foreign influences, to which the German spirit tended to be, as it remains, admiringly receptive. Thus Gothic architecture had penetrated, from Strassburg and Cologne, so sympathetic to the German imagination, in its later and more florid development, that it became generally known in the classic reaction against it as *Gothic* and therefore Germanic. So the art of gardening had slipped across the border from Holland, to find a hearty welcome. When humanism crossed the Alps solid burghers who had gone by the names derived from their craft, or that of some ancestor—Herr Weber, Schneider, or Schreiner—became *Textoris, Sartorius, Carpentarius,* in Latinized form. So with styles in clothing; "one need only come to Strassburg to see how Hungarians, Bohemians and Frenchmen dress," writes a chronicler.

While all this susceptibility to foreign modes and luxuries bothered the moralists, as destructive of German simplicity, the cultivated and traveled German bewailed the rawness of his countrymen.

Don't waste any time with combs, for such things are effeminate and unworthy of a man. Never mind if your hair is full of feathers, for that

---

[1] Luther, *Tischreden.*

[2] Giardano Bruno.

> shows you sleep on down and not on straw. To wash one's hands and face is unhealthy, and you might even die of it.[3]

> Whoever meets a man who struts like a rooster, while at the same time possessing the manners of a prize-fighter, a distracted air, the voice of a bull, the speech of a pedant . . . disorderly clothing, takes him immediately to be a German. Don't we recognize the Frenchman by his walk, his harmonious movements, friendly manner and voice, flowing speech, and lightly graceful garments? We mark the Spaniard by his solemn gait, his proud nose and sentimental voice, his carefully chosen words and elegant attire. We see Italians sauntering leisurely, articulate of gesture, mobile of facial expression, finished in refined elegance.[4]

On the other hand foreigners, once having taken it for granted that Germans were rather rough and loutish, and hard drinkers, were inclined to discover that they possessed virtues and advantages. Particularly they seemed prosperous, simple, pious, independent of spirit, hearty, *lebenslustig,* and free. This freedom was particularly the prerogative of the cities, many of which were *imperial* cities, bound to no subsidiary prince, defended by high walls, and obeying the emperor, as Machiavelli says, "when it pleased them."[5]

But this German freedom, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, rested to a considerable degree upon political disorganization, due in part to that failure of the imperial ideal to realize itself, which has been noted in the preceding chapter. The last truly German emperor, Maximilian, died in the second decade of the sixteenth century, after having exhibited considerable not always practicable or consecutive zeal to do the best of his people, among conditions which left him after all but little power to do anything. Some of the more forward-looking nobles had set about curing this disorderly condition of freedom in a thoroughgoing way, by even themselves crossing the Alps into Italy to study Roman law.

> After the teachings of the new legal lights, which deserve to be looked upon with suspicion, the Prince is rightfully everything in the land, the

---

[3] *Grobianus,* a long satiric poem, in the manner of a *Book of Etiquette* written sarcastically (1549).

[4] Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim (1532).

[5] *The Prince,* chap. x.

> People nothing. These latter should merely obey and pay taxes. The people should do service, not only to the Prince, but worse than that, to his officials too, who imagine themselves the real lords of the land, and arrange the whole business in such a way that the Prince himself rules as little as possible.[6]

So, on one side, this attempt to organize German law on the principles of Roman codes was criticized. On the other side, the old Germanic law, based upon custom and old precedents was not always fitting to the growing population and changing circumstances of life. It was a clash between the law of precedent (old cases and decisions) and the law of code.

> A collection of *cases* accumulated during many centuries is our law-book. . . . Confusion and injustice are unavoidable. Law makes all this definite; and laws are not variable.[7]

But, even granted that the German political situation might be simplified by the introduction of a more simplified and universalized law, there remained the question of legal administration, and here Germany offered further baffling complexities. We have outlined the condition of imperial power. With the ascension of Charles V to the imperial throne this power was further weakened by the fact that it was wielded by an emperor who had been born in Flanders, educated in Spain, and who had seldom time, among the various problems of his extended realm, to give any long concentrated attention to problems of the empire, which was but one of his several political cares. Behind the emperor were seven electors, all important German princes, three ecclesiastics, four lay nobles. When, in the fourteenth century, the question as to how and by whom the emperor was to be elected was definitely settled, these seven princes gained an increased power individually, and several important functions which they performed as a corporate body. Here then, already, we see three separate political interests: emperor, corporation of electors (Kurfürstenverein), and electors separately. But also the choice of these seven electors aroused jealousies between them and other important German princes, a fourth definite party interest. Finally there were the cities, often in clash, sometimes under signed and sealed charters of corporate privileges, against their princes or the emperor, separately or leagued together.

---

[6] Abt Wimphelming, quoted by Von Gleichen-Russwurm, *Die Sonne der Renaissance,* 281.

[7] These words Goethe puts into the mouth of a character in his drama of this period, *Götz von Berlichingen,* first act.

Behind this political screen of some formality there were still more formless currents of class dissatisfaction. The petty nobles hated the rising burghers of the cities, and often did not scruple to lay upon them with armed bands and rob them of their goods. There was discontent among the peasants. There were many currents of popular unrest, quick to float some religious standard or ensign upon a tide of revolutionary social reform. We are therefore prepared to find political motives and intrigue, social-economic aspirations, mingling with, directing, deflecting, beclouding, energizing, reënforcing the enthusiasm of intellectual inquiry and religious groping soon to be brought sharply and courageously to a head by Martin Luther.

For indeed the whole social aspect of Germany was engulfed in a profound and widespread sea of change. This change was everywhere active north of the Alps, but many special circumstances assisted it to penetrate more broadly different classes in Germany than, for example, in England or in France. The basis of this change were those *gloves and girdles* of which the peddler sang in the latter half of the thirteenth century. The demand for more, and for more luxurious articles of many kinds, had broadened steadily. Industry had profited by this demand. Trade had been stimulated throughout Europe. Commercial transactions traveled over larger areas, and then, at the very end of the fifteenth century, commerce had begun to traverse oceans, and wring wealth from far corners of the globe.

Germany, particularly between the Rhine and the Wieser, profited by this expansion of trade. Nuremberg drew its riches from seven languages, writes a fifteenth-century poet of that city: from Hungarians, Slavs, Turks, Arabs, French, English and Hollanders.[8] Germany too was noted for its clever artisans. Its city populations throve. Its peasantry, a larger proportion of whom owned the land they tilled than in France or England, also throve. Scottish kings might envy even a very middling prosperous burgher the house he lived in.[9] While in France, at this time, the bourgeois strove to dress as finely as the noble, in Germany it was turned around the other way. Nobles bankrupt themselves, selling lands and borrowing from Jews and Christians, striving to exhibit as great magnificence in their clothing as the thriving burghers.[10]

---

[8] The poet Rosenblüt.

This change was to affect the Reformation in two directions. Socially, it was in the end to fix the temper of the Reformation as a popular movement. Politically it was to weaken the influence of the lesser nobles, and add to the strength of the few with whom the political fortunes of the German Reformation were to rest.

But the economic situation in Germany was to affect the atmosphere of Germany in another way of religious import. It may be noted that, among the seven languages that enriched Nuremberg, Italian was not one. For centuries Germans, laboriously ascending the Alps from the less genial skies and darker forests of the north, to gaze upon the sun-bathed valley of the Po, had been tempted to plunder, and won to civilization. Italy was now no longer worth plundering, and as for civilization, the more robust luxuries of Flanders more appealed to these thriving Germans of the burgher class. Italy, turned back upon its past, delighting at the discovery and excavation of the *Laocoön,* was not yet to interest even those Germans who crossed to Italy with humanist enthusiasm.[11] And as for money, the stream had turned its direction. Commerce with Venice even had less to offer since the Turks had captured Jerusalem, and the pope, encouraging crusades against these Turks, was sucking ever larger and larger sums from pious Germans. "The Venitian is always perfidious;—the German is not always drunk"; so much at least there was of favorable choice, in the opinion of a German student in Italy.[12] The sole chain binding Germany to Italy was the papacy: *Dirumpans vincula eorum,* let us no longer bend our necks under the yoke of debased and degenerate Italy.[13]

---

[9] Æneus Sylvius.

[10] "Von der Kostlichkeit der Kleider kommt es viel her, dass es so sehr abwärts geht mit dem Adel in deutschen Länden. Sie wollen prunken als die reichen Kaufleute in den Städten tun. . . . Aber sie haben das Geld nicht was jene haben, und können nicht verdienen das zwanzig teil von ihren Gut, was jene mit dem Kaufscacher und schrecklichem Zinswucher verdienen. So kommen sie in grossen Schulden und verfallen dem Wucher der Juden unf Christen-juden, und müssen ihr Gut verkaufen und werden arme Edelleute. . . ." Quoted from a pamphlet and a chronicle, Von Gleichen-Russwurm, *Die Sonne der Renaissance,* 302.

[11] It was in the eighteenth century, with a work on this same Laocoön, that Lessing launched in Germany an enthusiasm for classic art.

The gold-hunger of Germany, the haste of people to get rich, the cynicism with which none asked how the money came, provided it gave evidence of having arrived, was mourned by many commentators upon the evils of the day. *Geld ist ihr Got* (Gold is their God) cried the cobbling, honest, and pious poet Hans Sachs. *Übertriebener Handel ist fürwahr ein Zweifelhaftes Gut* (Too much business is a doubtful blessing) wrote another.[14]

Er hat gewonnen, wie er mag,
Danach so hat man lützel Frag,
Er sei lam, krumb oder slecht,
Hat er Pfennig, er ist gerecht.[15]

But the very tone of such satire is one of moral shock. As everywhere while this class was forging to the front, industry, regular habits, domestic virtues, business dependability were business assets, upon which luxury, avarice, shrewd trading, shading off subtly into the many ways in which money breeds money quickly, might steal almost unperceived, under the pious garb of taking excellent care of one's family. And opulent burghers built large houses, where large families dined on gold and silver plate, never forgetting to ask God's blessing upon the food placed before them. Among the patient and laborious poor, piety was in Germany, as everywhere in Europe, quite the rule, but in Germany it had, as early as the end of the fourteenth century, attached itself with many to heretical tenets and sects. Waldensian adherents and communities were everywhere scattered, confined almost exclusively to peasants and laborers. The ideas of John Huss, who had been burned as a heretic by the Council of Constance, had never been extinguished. Huss had attacked particularly the claim of the papacy to ultimate authority in matters of doctrine, and a Roman Catholic historian of the Reformation in Germany cannot be far wrong in attributing in part to his influence bolder statements than his in the later fifteenth century: "I despise Pope, Church, and Councils, and I praise Christ," or more venomously, "The Pope is but a monkey clothed in purple."[16]

---

[12] Ulric von Hutten.

[13] Reuchlin.

[14] Trithemius.

[15] Sebastian Frank. (He got it the best way he could, and how one questions little. Be he lame, crooked or a plain bad egg, if he's got a penny, it absolves him.)

The religious atmosphere of Germany was in every way different from that of Italy. Germans and Italians had for centuries hated each other, and could hardly ever hope to understand each other. The Italians might have a capacity to coldly separate pompous symbolism which moved them, and human inconsistencies to which they were never blind. They might reverence the papacy, unwilling to see depart from it a single glitter of its august trappings, while cynically regarding even enormities of a pope or his *entourage*. Not so the Germans whose intellectual enthusiasms took them to Italy when the humanist awakening called many there.

> Da ich Rom erst sahe, fiel ich auf die Erde, hub meine
> Hände auf und sprach: Sei gegrüsst, du heiliges Rome.

So Martin Luther, arrived at Rome, fell upon his knees, raised his hands toward heaven, crying, "Greetings, Holy Rome!" He visited all the hallowed shrines, listened to the recounted legends, climbed the *sacred stairs* upon his knees—but what a disappointment! He saw the Holy City become a whore: the *Great Whore* of which the Biblical apocalypse had spoken. What he did not see perhaps none so well as an Italian can tell us:

> Monk and German, he was scandalized at seeing the luxury that accompanied the religious ceremonies, because he did not understand how the idea has need of transforming itself into symbol. . . . Thrown into the midst of liturgical splendors, which splendors are a sort of mystic expression of the creature's love toward God, and among the magnifi-

---

[16] Janssen, *L'Allemagne et la Réforme*, I, 580.

cences with which the Pontiff was surrounded, he took count of no other thing than the expense all this involved, and of the means by which this expense was met.[17]

Luther, when he visited Rome, was a very earnest and observant monk, shocked even to find that a proficient Italian priest might read three masses while he was reading one. But others from the North, more worldly wise than he, and farther traveled, did not find the Rome of Leo X that spot from which a pious expiration mounted toward heaven more freely than from any spot on earth.[18] When Leo died there came from the North a pope, to rule at Rome for some twenty months (Adrian VI), to banish magnificent luxury and humanist enthusiasms for ancient art and profane literature, to exclaim, before the classic marbles of the Vatican collection "*Proh! idola Barbarorum*" (Fie, barbarian idols). But, for the Italians, such men were the barbarians, and such a pope was a "barbarian pontiff," whose choice must be laid to some unaccountable extravagance of the Holy Spirit, more likely to choose the most worldly for pope, and not at times disdaining to prefer the most ambitious, avaricious profligate, or dishonest.[19] Men who *sought God in man, not in works of art*[20] approached the tradition of Eckhart, which tradition Rome had declared heretic more than two centuries earlier. Rome was after all the pope's Rome, and the pope was still, first of all, Italy's pope. Those who were not to be impressed by the magnificence of Leo X were almost certain to find less edifying things to impress them. Those who could not look upon Rome's religious inconsistencies with irony or skeptic raillery, loving with Italian susceptibilities just the pomp for what it was worth, if nothing more, were better to stay away from Rome entirely. In England they were saying that an Englishman Italianate was the Devil incarnate. It did not make good Catholics for Germans to go to Rome.

---

[17] Cantu, *La Réforme en Italie,* I; *Les Précurseurs,* 552.

[18] Tu l'as vu, ce ciel enchanté
Qui montre avec tant de clarté
Le grand mystère;
Si pur, qu'un soupir monte à Dieu
Plus librement qu'en aucun lieu
Qui soit sur terre.
Alfred de Musset's impression of Rome.

[19] Nothing could more plainly indicate the attitude of the Italian of keen and cold intelligence, toward the papacy, and toward the northern barbarians than the words of Guicciardini, commenting upon the election, and again upon the death of Adrian VI (book xiv, cap. v; book xv, cap. ii). Anyone not Italian "O almanco nutrito in Italia" was a mere incongruity as pope, despite the apparent lack of partiality of the Holy Spirit for saintly popes. Guicciardini, *Storia d'Italia,* finished shortly after 1532.

[20] Cantu, *La Réforme en Italie,* I, 527.

And so the spirit of German piety did not make for closer association with Rome. Indeed this piety was feeding on quite a different sort of food. The invention of printing was German, and the most popular printed book was soon to be the Bible. A contemporary of Guttenberg, the inventor of printing, recognized how the art of printing was a "two-edged sword." Church authorities were not slow to use the art in attempts to direct and control a movement that made it possible to gain information, to reflect upon and to contrast primitive Christianity and prevalent religious conditions, and to make such reflections and comparisons independently inclosed within the walls of one's own chamber. The increased importance of popular preaching, dating even from the middle of the thirteenth century, had stimulated interest and criticism in religion. But the preacher is in a measure an intellectual tyrant, able to force and direct attention more or less where he will. It now became necessary for the priest to follow his flock into the midst of the household group, into the private closets of religious reflection and devotion.

To meet this situation, bred largely of the art of printing, the art of printing might aid. Many pious handbooks, of unquestioned orthodoxy, were prepared, printed, and distributed among the faithful in Germany. Religious education, its path laid out in manuals, was encouraged in the family circle. After the service of the church, the father of the family was to gather his children and household together. He was to question them as to what they had gotten from the sermon, examine them as to their knowledge of the "Ten Commandments, the Seven Capital Sins, the *Paternoster,* and the Creed." Having instructed them, to the best of his ability, and with the aid of his handbook, a social beverage was to be handed around, after which the family service was to close with a hymn, "in praise of God, Our Lady, and the dear Saints of Paradise." [21]

Still another medium of religious pedagogy entered households. For those who, in the Middle Ages, could not read, picture books of the faith and tradition were exhibited upon the ecclesiastical edifices themselves, in frescoes, statuary, and colored glass. There were, to be sure, illuminated manuscripts, but such were treasures of princes and monastic communities. In general the laity could seldom look even upon a pictured representation of some figure or incident of Christian history or tradition apart from the complete complex of associations fortressed by the walls of the church edifice. But, from the middle of the fifteenth century pictures might be reproduced, by printing them from wooden plates, and religious picture books went into the houses and hands of thousands. Of such the most important was known as *The Bible of the Poor.* As to the arrangement or symbolism of this book there was little or nothing new, its contents being based upon much older manuscripts. The stories of the gospel cycle, enriched with but a very few apocryphal incidents, and concentrated upon the events of the Passion, were the subject of these pictures. One event from this cycle was represented upon each page, to the right and left of which Old Testament incidents were portrayed, taken to be prophetic prefigures of the corresponding event of Gospel story. To the left of the illustration of the Annunciation, the Serpent tempts Eve to eat the apple of baleful portent. Had Eve not sinned, men never would have been saved, it seems to suggest. To the right Gideon tempts God to manifest a *sign* upon the fleece of wool spread out in front of him.[22] Salvation is a miracle attesting God's power.[23]

The most far-reaching effect of printed books, of text or pictures, was not confined to the encouragement of more freedom of independent reflection in religious matters. With printed texts to peruse, pictures multiplied several thousand times, the imaginative fancy became more stereotyped when it dwelt upon the material of religion. Religion ceased to inspire, in a genuine way, religious art, and began to inspire religious discussion. Instead of Christians being drawn together emotionally, witnessing symbolic acts of ritual, which their imaginations might embroider, even while the acts were performed in a most perfunctory way by priest, Christians were to tend more and more, in their religious life, to be held together by patterns of conduct, no less rigid and monotonous, and from which the fanciful escape left no more tangible evidence than those fantasies of the medieval imagination, of which the crudest seldom gained reproduction in any tangible form. From this period, both among Protestants and Catholics, patterns of conduct became more and more the mark of the Christian. The flights of the imagination, the aspiring impulses of the will, were liberated to become secularized. Jesuits and Puritans were to form very different stereotype patterns, but at bottom the emphasis was to be on regularity rather than spontaneity. The whole period of the sixteenth century was to frighten people with the specter of liberated individuality. Religion was to be, in a way which the art of printing made possible as it never before had been, despite all the efforts of the Inquisition, a thing of outward patterns and standards. It was to become less and less of the imagination, a ritual drama engaging men's emotions, symbolizing and attaching them to a far-flung quest, fixing the temper and final thrust of aspiration; more and more one or another book of rules, in following which men and women might be recognized by their fellows as Christians.

---

[21] From a contemporary tract, *Himmelstrasse* (Road to Heaven) summarized and quoted by Janssen, *L'Allemagne et la Réforme,* 1, 25.

[22] See Judges VI. 36-40.

[23] *The Bible of the Poor* was reproduced in facsimile, Paris, 1883. There are thirty-nine scenes. Bits of text, mostly Biblical quotations, are still in Latin, attesting the fact that the text was not the important element.

"The Reformation," it has been said, "like most other revolutions, came not at the lowest ebb of abuse, but at a time when the tide had already begun to run, and to run strongly, in the direction of improvement." [24] But revolution is no matter of improvement, and the tide which was rising was revolutionary. It was soon to embrace matters with no intention to improve, but to rebuild upon another basis. A humanistic philosophy of Christ, such as that of Erasmus, which would have left the old forms standing, that they might be given a new interpretation, would not serve. The substance of popular hope and faith and its symbol are not attached in such a fluid manner. The only true iconoclast is he to whom the symbol is of such relative unimportance that it undermines his iconoclasms in the end. The burly energetic iconoclast is but unmasking one symbol grown unsatisfactory to replace it with another—the popular imagination was to be done with symbols of the imagination in religion. Picture and story must go; the written word was to rule, and this Jesuits as well as Protestants were to erect as the idol of religious faith.

---

[24] Smith, *The Age of the Reformation,* 26-27.

This task was, first of all, an intellectual task, and for it Germany was being prepared before the fifteenth century closed. Within half a century, subsequent to 1450, eight new universities were founded in Germany and Switzerland.

> Among the joys which the grace of God has permitted men in this fragile life, instruction and art are of the first rank. Thanks to these, indeed, is traced that road which leads to a good and holy life; human intelligence is clarified in true knowledge, in honest and praiseworthy habits; Christian faith is augmented, law and the common interest attain a firm foundation.[25]

So the ducal patron of one of these universities lauds its purpose. But these universities, despite such prognostications, became cities perilous from the religious standpoint. Not only had they the old medieval tradition of freedom of thought, but what was of larger portent, they were young, just when the older universities of Europe were tending to harden, as the theological arbiters of Christendom.[26] They were bound by no settled conservatisms which nullified freedom charters granted. Considerable of their financial underpinning was in the rising burgher class, who had nothing at stake in the old order; no reason to love or strengthen any of the older landed interests, of Church or nobility, which had preceded them, and to which in many ways they still must bow. These universities assimilated almost from the beginning the humanist antagonism for the scholastic system of philosophy. They studied Greek and Hebrew; the Bible, Greek and Latin poets, as well as philosophers, nor did they study these writings as an elegant diversion from serious thought about life and eternity. This rising burgher class, who had learned the hard-cash value of honesty and industry, had no time nor interest for cultural fastidiousness. On the contrary, they would be more inclined to laugh it out of court, along with the chivalric liturgy, which the upstart French banker, Jacques Cœur, had ordered portrayed in satiric ridicule, to decorate the chimneyplace of one of the principal rooms of his palatial residence at Bourges.

---

[25] Louis, Duke of Bavaria.

[26] Approximately from the time of the papal settlement at Avignon, the Sorbonne became the recognized authority in theology. During that period they rebuked an erroneous theological opinion of an Avignon pope.

In somewhat this spirit a series of pamphlets, arising from theological and ecclesiastical controversy, and circulating first in German university circles, made nonsense, scurrilous often, sacrilegious sometimes, out of many abuses; and not these only, but deeper conceptions, connected with the religious-social-intellectual structure. An example taken from these pamphlets, published ostensibly as letters of younger or older theologians or clerics to an important, imaginary person, under the title of *Letters of Obscure Men,* may illustrate the manner and spirit in which this attack was carried on.

The subject here is the allegorical, and often fanciful, interpretations which made it possible to use incidents or verses from the Bible to support almost any practice or opinion which seemed to need this sort of crutch. The art of figurative interpretation of troublesome passages of sacred writings, as we have had occasion before to note, was inherited by earliest Christians from the Jews, of Alexandria particularly. Augustine employed it, Gregory the Great elaborated it, Bernard further systematized it. The tradition was hallowed by long usage. It became a consistent part of the medieval conception that all nature, and the entire content of knowledge, was a sign language, leading up to theology, and through theology to God. In turning out this long-utilized method of interpreting the Bible, an ass's tail pinned to its retreating back, the indecent gesture of farewell presented is sufficiently comprehensive to carry much along with it.

> Brother Conrad Stupidpate, to Master Ortwein Gratius—Greeting and humble devotion, with daily prayers to our master, Jesus Christ; Venerable Sir:—Do not be bored because I write you of my affairs, when you have so many more important things to do. You told me once always to write you, whatever I was studying, and not to give up study, since I had a good intelligence and, with the assistance of God, should be able well to succeed, if I but set my mind to it. So, I write you that I have given myself to study at Heidelberg, and work at theology. But, together with this, I hear a daily lecture on poetry, in which study, through the grace of God, I make notable progress. I now know by heart all the tales of Ovid in the *Metamorphoses,* and I have learned to expound them literally, figuratively, and spiritually, in three different senses. . . . But, you may ask, whence I have gained all this subtility of exposition? My answer is, that lately I acquired a book, by one of our English Masters, of our own religious order . . . who has composed this book upon Ovid's *Metamorphoses,* expounding all the fables allegorically and spiritually. You have no idea how profound he is in theology! There can be no doubt but that the Holy Spirit poured into this man the doctrine he expounds, for he writes of the concordance between sacred Scriptures and the fables of the poets. . . . Jupiter, ravishing the virgin Europa, is even included in sacred Scripture (a thing I never knew before) because in one passage of Scripture he said to her, "Look, Daughter, and give attention; incline thine ear, for the King has desired thy beauty.[27]

Those curious to mark contrasts time may work in human attitudes, may contrast this with another fanciful divine love story, attributed to Peter Damiani, and recounted in an earlier chapter.[28]

The later Middle Ages were responsible for the growth in popularity of two doctrines, one of which pushed forward in spite of theological authority because of its inherent popular appeal, the other of which was pushed forward because it had a popular appeal of decided practical advantage to the pope particularly.

The former of these two doctrines had arisen as early as the middle of the twelfth century, owing to the emotional desire of all classes to free the Virgin from all blot of *original sin.* The thought that Mary, so potent to aid mankind that but for her in Heaven there would be "for mankind nothing but the blackness of night," might share the curse fallen upon humanity from the sin of Adam and Eve was intolerable. So much for the desire to see her unspotted, but theologians saw difficulties in freeing her from participation in this guilt. For Mary's long and ever-branching family-tree might be presumed to number a considerable collection, any single member of which could also presumably pass on the guilt of Adam and Eve to her. So the best scholastic authority, Thomas Aquinas included, rested content to concede her sinless, by some special divine sanctification, though not, according to the expression which pushed forward in popular sympathy, *immaculately conceived.*

---

[27] *Epistolorum Obscurorum Virorum ad Dom. Ortvinum* (above translated from ed. Raspe, Frankfort, 1757).

[28] Chap. xxix above.

The Dominican friars were obliged to follow Aquinas, the great master whom they were so proud to number of their order. But the Franciscans, at once jealous of their brother friars and closer to the popular current, became defenders of the belief in her immaculate conception. Rome chose to remain silent, and succeeded in avoiding definite pronouncement until 1854, by which time the popular appeal of any particular doctrine might be presumed of greater import than any difference of opinion between two monastic orders.

During all the intervening centuries controversy as to this doctrine of the *Immaculate Conception* of the Virgin repeatedly appeared, and most often in the form of controversy or controversial action of some sort, between the Dominicans and the Franciscans. This controversy caused scandal in Berne, at the beginning of the sixteenth century. A young Swiss, Hans Jetzer, lay brother of the Dominican order, was frightened the very night after his reception by strange noises in his cell. He fled in terror to the Carthusians, who returned him to his own monastery. The night following his return a spectre appeared to him in his cell, announcing itself as a soul fled from purgatory. The frightened Jetzer was implored to "save" this soul, by eight days prostration and flagellation in a certain chapel. When Jetzer had accomplished this penance, the specter appeared again; this time to announce that the Franciscan who had formulated the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was its fellow sufferer in purgatory. When news of this visitation spread through the town the Franciscans were naturally disturbed. Then the Virgin herself visited Hans in his cell, leaving with him three tears of Jesus, three drops of his blood, a crucifix, and a letter to the pope, advising him to abolish the Feast of the Conception, which had crept many places into the Church calendar. The Virgin then proceeded to pierce the hands and feet of this Dominican with a nail, that they too, as well as the Franciscans, might have a saint possessing the "stigmata."

So far all went well. Brother Hans, now the local marvel, spent his days fasting in a room frescoed with representations of the Passion, while wondering crowds regarded him from the doorway. The visits of the Virgin became more frequent, she became more communicative, till one night Jetzer recognized the voice of his confessor, and said so. Mary immediately disappeared, coming back some nights later to reprove his lack of faith. This time he recognized, and more certainly, the voice of the prior. This discovery so frightened the Dominicans that they attempted to poison Jetzer, who escaped and made the matter public. Four implicated Dominicans were burned alive before a crowd of thirty thousand, and the report of the occurrence spread, at an inopportune moment, through Europe.

The other doctrine, approved by a papal bull in the mid-fourteenth century, was less a thing of popular inception than a happy idea helping to make reasonable the growing generosity of the Church in granting, for considerations not all commutable into money, relaxation of divine punishment for sin.

This was the doctrine of the Church's *Treasure of Merit.*

Church councils, from the earliest of them, fixed in formal enactment the character and term of penance required of Christians who had, by sinning, temporarily lost their good standing in the Christian community. The arrangement of punishment for sin by ecclesiastical authority was therefore of very early precedent. Then the doctrine of purgatory, which provided a place of penitential punishment after death, was settled in the seventh century, upon the authority of Gregory the Great. It needed but the opportunity of the Crusades for the Church's authority in the matter of punishment for sin to traverse the boundary between earth and purgatory. Martyrdom had been, in the early Church, a sure road to paradise. To die as a crusader, in redeeming the Sacred Sepulcher, was evidently to suffer martyrdom, and even willingness to so risk one's life evidenced the martyr spirit. So, from the First Crusade, those who sewed the cross upon their shirts were granted *indulgence,* on the authority of the pope, from the pains of purgatory.

The scope of crusading, as we have seen, broadened out considerably as time went on. Indulgences did not only keep pace with this extension, but they were found convenient in many other exigencies, many of which might be removed, or rendered less troublesome, with the assistance of money. In 1300 Boniface VIII created the *Jubilee Indulgence,* which first entailed incidental pilgrimage to Rome for the ceremony of jubilee; but before this century had passed the Jubilee Indulgence might be purchased without the pilgrimage. Jubilees too, first intended to be celebrated but once a century, came to demand more frequent celebration.[29]

The practice of granting indulgences, like many other traditional practices of the Church, long maintained itself and grew without theological authorization. But, as the granting of indulgences became more and more a common practice, it became more and more necessary to be assured that the Church really had something substantial to give in return for money collected for these indulgences. And so, in the middle of the fourteenth century, official sanction was given to the discovery of the great Franciscan doctor, Alexander of Hales, that the Church possessed a *treasure of merit,* from which it might dispense remission of purgatorial pains through countless ages. This treasure consisted "primarily and completely of the merit of Christ our Savior," which was

[29] The jubilee period was first reduced to fifty, to thirty-three, finally to twenty-five years, within the medieval period.

infinite, therefore inexhaustible. It had, however, further increments. Not the Virgin only, but some at least among the martyrs and saints, had accumulated more than enough merit to save themselves personally. This merit of Christ, together with the superfluous merit of Virgin, Martyrs, and Saints, the sole remaining value of which was the vicarious saving of other persons than themselves, had been handed to the Church, to be dispensed by the pope.

From then there was no longer legitimate question as to the ability of the Church to go on shortening purgatorial pains indefinitely. There were, to be sure, a number of fine points complicating the matter, but upon these it was not essential to insist, thus troubling prospective purchasers with subtle differences between *punishment* and *guilt,* or to emphasize the part played by *contrition* in the effective operation of indulgences. If the Church said, on papal authority, "I give you, for a consideration most conveniently money, the remission of ten or fifty thousand days of punishment in Purgatory," it was meticulous to soil such consolation by too close examination of attendant conditions. For, if one took this promise upon its face value, the dark shadow which overhung medieval life was removed. The purchasing sinner was "reëstablished in that innocence and purity" he had enjoyed at the moment of his baptism; "the gate which leads to the paradise of joy" would be opened to him.[30]

> I care not how many and how great sins I commit before God, for I shall easily and quickly get plenary remission of any guilt and penalty whatsoever by absolution and indulgence granted from the Pope, whose writing and grant I have bought for fourpence or sixpence, or for a game of tennis.[31]

Then came a further extension of the efficacy of these indulgences. They became valid, not only for the living, but for the dead.

> Do you not hear your deceased parents wail and cry out: have mercy on us! We are suffering grievous punishment and pain which you can save us with a trifling alms.[32]

---

[30] From a Bull of Indulgence as peddled in Germany by Tetzel.

[31] So, satirically, writes the sixteenth-century English author, Gasgoigne.

[32] From a sermon of Tetzel (Bohmer, *Luther in the Light of Recent Research*).

This extension was recognized even in Italy, by one who deplored the Reformation as replete with *detestable and pernicious errors, pestiferous and diabolical inventions,* as a clear abuse of the legitimacy of indulgences, due to the too great *facility of character* of a pope (Leo X). As for the ability of indulgences to free souls in Purgatory, the historian Guicciardini adds:

> Such a thing has neither in itself any verisimilitude, nor a shred of authority, as it was notorious that such indulgences were conceded merely for the extraction of money from men more generously provided with simplicity than prudence.[33]

Germans were more generously provided with such pious simplicity than Italians, and it was in Germany that indulgences were for a time most flagrantly and lucratively exploited. The full financial possibilities were not immediately recognized, but gradually arrangements for distribution were perfected, the financing generally in the hands of the banking house of Fugger, and pardoners went abroad to sell. The pardoner, arrived with his confessors, treasurers, and slotted boxes, was met at the gates of a town by ecclesiastical dignitaries and cheering townsfolk, to be escorted in, and to set up his red cross, "more efficacious than even the cross of Christ itself," for the pardon of man's past and even future sinnings. The story is told, in the chronicle of the Saxon town of Meissen, that a gentleman bought from the most notorious pardoner of all (Tetzel), for the sum of thirty sous, pardon for a sin he was about to commit, the nature of which was undisclosed. He then laid for the pardoner himself in a bit of woods as he departed, beat him thoroughly, and made off with his money chest. Complaint was brought, the assailant brought to trial, whereupon he produced his pardon purchased in anticipation from the victim himself, and was absolved from punishment in consequence by the duke.[34]

The particular campaign of selling indulgences which precipitated the German Reformation was authorized by a bull of Leo X in 1513. The practice of selling them had now become universal and "permeated the whole church life of the time." [35] The right of collecting this indulgence was farmed to an ambitious prelate, the Archbishop of Mainz, already greatly in debt to the Fuggers for their financial assistance in acquiring two archbishoprics and one important episcopal see.[36] The house of Fugger stood behind to hold the bag, advancing expense money, and ready to recoup sums owed to them. A Dominican already mentioned (Tetzel) who had already demonstrated his energy and fertility of invention in such sales, had been given the task of superintending the campaign of collection. Ostensibly the money was to be used in building the Basilica of St. Peter, that still crowns the Vatican Hill in Rome. As a matter of financial arrangement one-half the proceeds had already been granted the Hohenzollern prince and prelate who was in part, and aspired to be completely, Archbishop of Mainz, Archbishop of Magdeburg, and Bishop of Halberstadt.

---

[33] Guicciardini, *Storia d'Italia,* lib. xiii, cap. v. The whole passage from which this is extracted is a masterpiece of concise expression of what was probably the general Italian opinion of the Reformation in influential circles.

[34] This story is told, on the authority of the Meissen Chronicle, by D'Aubigne, *History of the Reformation,* I, 323-324.

People had become a little skeptical as to what became of money collected for these indulgences.[37] The methods of Tetzel in peddling them were known to be particularly sensational, and the Elector of Saxony had forbidden Tetzel's entrance into his principality. The boundary line of the principality, however, approached very near to the city of Wittenberg, where Luther taught and preached; so near that citizens might conveniently go to the next town to buy their pardons when Tetzel set up shop there. So it came about that Tetzel, before beginning his sale, demanded of Luther a public acknowledgment of the efficacy of those indulgences which he was about to offer for sale, and met with Luther's refusal. So, with Luther drawn directly into the affair, we are upon the threshold of the German Reformation.

---

[35] *Cambridge Modern History,* II, 121.

[36] Among the difficulties confronting this aspirant were the necessity of obtaining papal absolution for his illegal holding of two bishoprics even, while aspiring for a third, and also for the fact that he had not yet arrived at the canonical age for holding any bishopric at all.

[37] Guicciardini accuses Leo X of giving money from the sale of indulgences in Germany to his sister.

# XLIII

If the insulting and heavily threatening words of the Cardinal di San Sisto, papal legate, had not driven [Luther] to the extremity of desperation, presumably it would have been easy, by conferring upon him some office of dignity, or some means of decent living, to have withdrawn him from his errors.[1]

If the Devil catches me idle . . . he insinuates conscientious fears lest I have taught falsely, rent asunder the Church, resting so fine, still, and peaceful under the Papacy. . . . Truly, I can't deny that the consequences often make me anxious and uneasy.[2]

HAD we placed ourselves at the elbow of Martin Luther, while his pen indited his ninety-five *theses against indulgences,* it might well have appeared to us, as it appeared to almost everybody, friends included, that he had set his feet in a way that was perilous, to himself and to the whole of Europe. The commonest charges against him were that he was moved by personal vanity. that he was presumptuous, that he was rash and extravagant, pushing premises which many were willing to grant toward too uncompromising conclusions. That the medieval religious structure was invalid seems evident to us. Wherever it is probed, with the dry dissection of history, it manifests some disease. The Curia was judged, even by discerning contemporaries in Italy and elsewhere, worldly, crafty, grasping, often dissolute. The reform of the prelates was considered by an early Jesuit zealot a thankless and impossible task. Monasticism in general was limping, begging, hoarding, quarreling in petty jealousies. The parochial clergy was largely ignorant, slothful, gluttonous; not seldom lecherous and drunken. Lay Christians were desperately gambling for salvation, by purchasing indulgences. Such judgments doubtless do not touch everywhere, leave much of more serene faith and consistent effort uncounted; but this, there is much evidence to show in every country, was Christianity's conspicuous outward aspect.

---

[1] Guicciardini, *Storia d'Italia,* XIV, i (si crede sarebbe stato facile, dandogli qualche dignita, o qualche modo honeste di vivere, farlo partire dagli errori suoi).

[2] Luther, *Tischreden.* (Wenn mich der Teufel müssig findet macht er . . . mir ein Gewisen, als habe ich unrecht gelehrt, den vorigen Stand der Kirche, der unter dem Papstthum fein, still und friedsam war, zerrissen. . . . Nun, ich kann nicht leugnen, mir wird oft angst und bange darüber.)

Guicciardini and Luther are both men whose personal temper and quality stand out clearly in their style, and no translation can quite suggest what these few words do in the original.

And of this Church the acutely sensitive and deeply conscientious Luther might later think, as having rested "*fein, still und friedsam*" before he disturbed it!

As a matter of fact few persons of importance wished to see it so disturbed, and it soon became subject of bitter and sarcastic comment generally in Europe, that an obscure monk had presumed to set in motion such a troublesome movement of reform. Bandages, poultices, and crutches might be tendered, but there seemed to be a haunting fear everywhere, to which for an instant Germany was no exception, that the patient would expire under radical treatment. And the patient could not be allowed to expire, for many reasons affecting different persons in various ways. For here was a patron, both spiritually and materially opulent. Its patronage included eternal salvation, pardon from penitential pains, modest or more generous livings, brilliant careers, not to speak of less tangible but still important matters such as intellectual surety and social order. Moreover, this patron had no apparent heir, and all this patronage, so far as anyone could plainly see, would die along with him.

It is certain that not every obscure monk could have seen what Luther saw, or would have dared what Luther dared when he had seen. It is also hardly less certain that Luther far from saw all that he dared, and had he seen all, hardly would have dared himself. Had he not been an obscure monk, a popular preacher and laborious professor in a little town, with a simple, rugged nature of no balanced subtleties, and small experience with the complication of interest and motive that sifts and settles into social stability, from the inertia of habit (that instinct to abide the devil that one knows, for fear of a devil with whom one is not acquainted), and by the fortuitous offsetting of one destructive impulse by another equally destructive, rather than because of any harmonious homogeneity or inherent logic, could or would he have dared?

The German Reformation was by no means the only revolutionary movement in sixteenth-century Europe, but it was that one revolutionary movement without which none of the others ever could have gone at that time very far. It was the only one which could touch a spark to all the inflammable social tinder lying about. The economic world, the political world, the intellectual world were all at strain. But the economic world and the political world have an immense stake in public order, and the intellectual world is seldom revolutionary, save when it finds itself disenfranchised of more orderly employment. The economic world and the political world were closely wed together in the sixteenth century. It was an age of economic despoiling, and the princes of politics and of trade were companion spoilers. The reign of Elizabeth in England furnishes perhaps an example of the most practicable friendly arrangement. The human imagination was inflamed, but the princes of the imagination were the protégés of those other princes of politics and trade. It was an age of the masterful élite, not of the broad mass of the people, whose broadest common emotions and aspirations were still bound in union by religion. So long as the Church held these masses securely in its control, the masterful might vie with one another in brilliant daring or display, or cut one another's throats. They scorned the mass, who knew themselves scorned, accepted the scorn very largely, looking to death, as in the *Dance of Death,* as the great leveler, and to eternity as the cure of human injustices and ills of every sort.

And so, when you touched upon eternity, you touched upon a deep interest of the common man, and when you touched the Church, in such a way as to disturb its position as arbiter of eternal life, you put the fate of the common man in a new sense into his own hands. Here a storm was unloosed, a storm of such violence that all Europe was soon engaged, whether Catholic or Protestant, in stemming it. It does not take much courage to join in the pillage of a temple which has been desecrated, without bringing down the immediate vengeance of the deity which inhabits it, but it takes a great deal of courage to strike the first blow, bursting in the door of this temple, while all about bystanders watch to see the lightning strike the profaner to the ground.

Martin Luther struck the first decisive blow, while Europe gasped. The lightning did not strike him down, and soon Europe was a battleground of pillagers and defenders. This is to forget neither his precursors nor almost immediate accomplices and defenders. But Luther dared the lightning and survived. This was the sort of proof the people waited for. Strained cords, in the economic, political, and intellectual worlds, were snapped; a turmoil of change was unloosed, and when this troubled world had been ordered again, it was another and different world.

This it is which makes Martin Luther the outstanding character of the sixteenth century, and one of the four outstanding characters of that religion which was based upon the memory of Jesus. And, as we look with broad survey over his personality and career, it seems that but two things were essential in order that the qualities which were in him might so develop as to serve as they were to serve. First it was necessary that he have within himself an unshakable certainty upon which his conscience, and his simple sturdy courageousness might rest. Second it was necessary that his original and remarkably comprehensive mind should be able to get its intellectual underpinning arranged, before disturbing tides of practical circumstances too violently beset him. Like many another serious, sensitive, and conscientious soul, he might be troubled, muddled, frightened or befooled in the midst of hard, wily, self-seeking and complicated opportunist currents. He needed opportunity to sweep over the territory, with which he was to deal both destructively and constructively, while still he remained very largely a leader with a clear comprehensive mind of few subtleties, closeted with a virile and remarkably pungent pen. Indeed Luther himself, if we follow but a little farther the passage quoted from him above, seems to admit as much. *"Sobald ich aber das Wort ergreife, habe ich gewonnen!"* —No sooner have I laid hold upon the word than my battle is won.

Such is the man whose life and religious experience we turn to briefly review. We need not linger over all the facts, which are in general well known and easily available; but we may rather confine ourselves to tracing how he came to get this unshakable foundation under his feet, and how he formulated, more comprehensively than anyone, that vision which was to be tossed into the ring, to be torn at and flung about by the various forces which the Reformation unloosed.

We have been fortunate in approaching Luther from the Middle Ages, for only in such approach is one likely to remark how little he belongs to them essentially. He was, to be sure, hardly a child of the sixteenth century, and such a child of that century as Guicciardini, from whom a passage has been quoted at the head of this chapter, could understand less easily than one of the twelfth century, Bernard for example, how Luther never might have been bought off with an ecclesiastical dignity or a decent living. Luther's simplicity of conviction then, if you will, may be accredited to the Middle Ages. So, largely, may the quality of his imagination be credited to that fanciful age, elaborated with all the Flemish flamboyances which were to make the late Gothic so sympathetic to the German taste. But, were one obliged to call Luther because of this medieval, one might also be tempted to call Rabelais medieval. The quality of the medieval imagination was not banished or transformed in a few decades. Upon the heels of the Renaissance it cropped out again, hybrid and distorted, in the *baroque.* But Luther's modern note has little or nothing to do with the Renaissance, which scarcely touched him consciously. It arose from his premises. He built no longer from the medieval foundation, when his own thought had found its footing; and, having lingered months among ideas, personalities, and social forms of the medieval period, to read fifty pages of Luther is to find oneself in another world more modern even than that fascinating patchwork called the Renaissance. It is not that much medieval framework and imagery does not remain, nor that much of his criticism does not descend toward the commonplace, as common with him to many contemporaries. But he sweeps the board so clean, moves about and readjusts institutions with such broad freedom, that a new Europe seems to arise, a Europe of which many in their piously thoughtful moments still dreamed until, somewhere in the later nineteenth century, disillusion began to spread. It was a Europe which aspired, in such piously thoughtful moments, to ennoble every social function, and ennoble mankind in its social, even its economic functioning, by setting Christianity to work as a pedestrian force, instead of erecting it, in a symbolic institution, as the vision of life among other than worldly circumstances.

The vision we need not expect to see realized. It was, however, in the seventeenth century as we shall see, to develop clearer lines, and discover inherent contradictions. It was to find a place for cant, hypocrisy, and smug respectability, which made the fanciful medieval man, taking his eternity far too seriously on the one hand, far too familiarly on the other, seem ridiculous, childish in his naïve, sometimes beautiful gesturing. But all this, like much else which Luther himself was to look upon with surprise and fear, when unleashed by his revolutionary ideals, was no part of his intention. So we must attempt to see him first, and to get a glimpse of his vision, before it began to be messed and obliterated by revolutionary currents first, and afterwards by evolutionary currents.

The life of Martin Luther began, not only modestly, but one might even add, timidly and fearfully. His father was born a peasant of old Saxon Thuringia, where independent landowners of the peasant class were not few, and where the *Bauerstand* long retained a rugged class pride. Luther's father, however, did not continue his life as a farmer. Shortly after Martin's birth he settled in the mining town of Mansfeld, where he prospered in a small way as a smelter. Hans Luther was a coarse and stern, even at times a cruel father, but a pious parent, of that brand of piety spread among the poor by printed cathechisms and manuals of devotion with edifying pictures. Luther never forgot his floggings. Years later he said of his father, "Once he thrashed me so vigorously that I ran away from him, conceiving an attitude of hostility," which attitude lasted, he continues, *"bis er mich wieder zu ihm gewöhnte."* Luther does not tell in what way he again became accustomed to his father, but in another place he writes that parents, in well-meaning parental tenderness permit themselves to call their children *fools, rascals,* or *hürlein,* which epithets from another they would never allow. An early schoolmaster intensified this shrinking acceptance of brutal punishment, as a necessary element in the regeneration of youth. So, for his boyish imagination, it became easy to picture the Church as "the Pope's house," in which the primate exercised parental disciplinary jurisdiction.

Dread of parental wrath followed him into manhood, so that later, when suddenly he decided to become a monk, he fled to the cloister without telling his father of his intention. Further, he fled there to help his superiors thrash the sin out of his offending nature.

But Luther's youth was by no means overhung with a gloomy cloud, which cut off the sunlight. Though sensitive and deeply conscientious, marked doubtless in these early years with a conviction of sinfulness which was later to play such a decisive rôle in his life—out of which he might cry: *"O, wenn willst du einmal fromm werden, und genug tun, dass du einen gnädigen Gott kriegst?"* (When will you become pious, and do enough to find a merciful God)—such moods were neither so persistent to interfere with industry or set him aside from the friendly currents of life. Also, his father, though rough and harsh, had ambitions for his son. Though educated first as a charity student, given bed and tuition free, and permitted to beg his food from door to door, when ready for the university, his father was able to send him, no longer such a dependent, to the most celebrated German university of the day, Erfurt.

Destined by his father to a career as a lawyer, he set industriously to work, and received his preliminary degrees of Bachelor and Master of Arts. Erfurt was, however, a city of monks and churches, as important in the religious life of Germany as Cologne had been in the century of Thomas Aquinas, and called in Germany *Little Rome.* Hardly important to-day, a little city of Thuringia known largely for its flower and seed market, it then might boast some twenty-seven churches, thirty-six chapels, and twenty monastic cloisters; enough to keep before Luther's attention his battle to win God's approval. All, so far as we know, went regularly enough until the summer of 1505. His preliminary university studies were finished, he was Master of Arts. In the summer of that year the *pest* broke out in Erfurt. Many students and teachers fled, Luther remained, and around him several friends were victims of the plague. His law lectures began, and "he felt himself repelled by a science which followed only worldly ends."[3] Then, returning to Erfurt during a long walk, he was overtaken in a near-by village by a thunderstorm. While the thunder and lightning raged about him he suddenly resolved, "I will become a monk." Two weeks later he invited a circle of friends, passed with them a gayly sociable evening, apparently saying nothing to them of his intention, and the next day he took refuge in the Augustinian Friary at Erfurt, where he became a novice, and began to outdo all the others in the severity of his asceticism. Despite criticism of monastic abuses, the ascetic way was far from having been rejected.

Das ist freilich ein fremder Orden,
Darin der Teufel Abt ist worden.[4]

Criticized monasteries were a "strange and foreign Order, in which the Devil was abbot," but no life in all the world was so "certain of the reward of eternal salvation" as the proper life of a monk, in a properly conducted community.[5] So Luther fasted, scourged himself, practiced all approved methods of subjugating erring inclinations. Believing that the proper spirit of obedience was inspired by love, he was continually conscious of the fact that his purificatory efforts sprang from fear. With his frequent confessions he wearied his superiors even. While acquiring a reputation for sanctity he was tortured by the conviction that he was eternally condemned, and vainly sought a *merciful God.*

---

[3] Benrath, *Luther im Kloster, 1505-1525.*
[4] Murner (Der Schelmenzunft), *Der Teufel ist Abt* (1512).
[5] *Bad des Gewissens,* a tract from the later Middle Ages.

But such discipline did not consume all his energy. His community was at the time the best-reputed monastic order in Germany; his own monastery, in a university city, was a busy intellectual center, under an enlightened, scholarly, and high-minded prior. Luther was still a hard student, now in the field of theology. Also he *discovered* a Bible in the monastery library. Hitherto he had known it but in disconnected passages. His order supported the Scotist type of theology, with accent upon the will, rather than the intellect as in the school of Aquinas.

Scourging and inward struggles went on for two years. Then, in the writings of Paul, he discovered a promise bringing inner security and peace. Not many months later he was reading passionately, and annotating enthusiastically, the works of Augustine. He began to study Greek, though he never became proficient; snatched at opportunities to learn a little Hebrew, but teachers were few and hard to find. Beginning to compare Biblical passages he developed critical acumen, discovered spurious attributions of authorship later scholarship has confirmed. He dared to criticize Origen and Jerome. Humanism touched him, but neither from its center nor in his own. Soon he was a teacher in his order, before thirty a Doctor in the university faculty of theology and sent as professor to the new University of Wittenberg. Here he soon attracted attention, both as preacher and teacher, but not for any suspicious newness of doctrine; rather for his moral earnestness, and the freshness with which he clarified and illustrated the Biblical text.

But not until he began to study Paul's *Epistle to the Romans* did he see clear light upon his own difficulties, and to develop therefrom theological interpretations differing both from those of the Scholastics and the humanists.

Scholastics had interpreted the "righteousness of God," referred to in this Epistle, as the *justice* with which God measured rewards and punishments. In the Latin translation Luther knew familiarly the important verse beginning: *Justitia enim Dei,* translating naturally "For the justice of God, etc." But, in the Greek, still more clearly in the Hebrew context, it hardly means justice as the attribute of a judge, but rather the quality which made men approved of God, and also a quality of God's personality. In English this quality is translated *righteousness.* While Luther interpreted with the Schoolmen, the *justice of God* terrified him. Himself conscious of flaws, how much more severely would God judge them!

Reading a little farther he might have questioned, for the passage continues, "For the *justitia* of God is revealed in [the Gospel] from faith to faith." The justice revealed in an act of judging would hardly be described as *from faith to faith.* A continuing process, rather than a single definitive act, seems implied. But a man with an obsession does not read with open eyes where the obsession is touched. One day, however, he appears to have read with opening eyes straight through to the end of the verse. We may assume that he read before as well as after. Paul writes:

> For I am not ashamed of the gospel message, for it is the power of God for the salvation of every believer, to the Jew and to the Greek; since in it is revealed the righteousness of God from faith into faith; as it is written, *From out faith the righteous shall live.*[6]

To live *ek pisteos,* or *ex fide* (for here Latin or Greek makes little difference) we may a little understand to-day, "biologically" conscious of life, as if unrolling from a germinal cell. Even for Luther the *from-outness* of life, starting inward in what he called faith, could hardly remain entirely enigmatic when brooded upon, which he tells us he did. Faith was not then a shibboleth; one lived by, through, or from out it, and thus it was a hidden inward thing.[7] The Christian doctrine of original sin testified to the essential evil of human nature. Therefore any regenerating agency must have been communicated from without (and here stood the medieval Church to confer from without the necessary grace); or, if planted in him, without exterior communication, God must have planted it there directly.[8]

---

[6] Romans I. 16-17.

[7] "Und diese Gerechtigkeit ist allerdings ein gar heimlich und verborgen Ding, davon die Welt nichts weiss noch verstehet."

All of Luther's inward impulses toward holiness became suddenly, no longer the accusing index-finger of a stern judge making him conscious of where such impulses fell short of being the whole of him, but rather the germ of the very thing he was seeking. The consciousness of evil that had troubled him was not evidence of God's absence from, but rather proof of his presence in him. He possessed the righteousness he sought. He has not won or earned it; it had been conferred upon him by a generous love. So he need no longer seek it; only rest in it, work with it, let it grow and lead him. This new assurance rested at the precise point from which old fears had spread; and where there had been agitation there was now, energized by the same zeal with which he has scourged himself, liberated confident faith, as individual and personal in its basis as the *virtu* of Renaissance egoism.

For, strangely enough, although the Renaissance scarcely touched Luther, here he touched it, ran into its current from the religious angle, was to further and more broadly energize it positively, and help it tear things loose to the disturbance of social calm and peace.

This new assurance, erected as a formula to be transmitted to others, might become an embarrassing and troublesome affair. It told no one what to do or what not to do. It seemed to remove the rod of chastisement from the hand of an eternal judge who still presided over the individual and social fortunes of Christendom. It might appear to assure people that, if they followed with faith their instincts, something had been planted by God in them to save them at the end, in spite of everything. Here it might be a liberator of the *ego* touching a far broader sphere than the pagan

---

[8] ". . . die nicht wir durch unser eigen Thun selbst schaffen oder werken, sondern sie einen andern in uns schaffen und wirken lassen" (*Galäterbrief*).

*virtu* of the Renaissance, for many might dare to cut loose with God's approval who would scarcely dare so far in defiance of him. So might it become dangerous social doctrine, that needed a Calvin, to set up again a very simple law, chiseled in stone in ancient days when human society was arranged tribally, and to make the rod of punishment again conspicuous in the eyes of those who might be tempted to trouble the peaceful industry of the elect, with their free action.

But all that was for the moment important was the effect of this religious experience, and this new assurance, upon one Martin Luther himself. He had solved his difficulty in a way which was cousin, certainly, to the *mystic way;* had come to feel himself knit to God in the center of his own being, and not by means of any external intermediators. Indeed he had discovered in manuscript an anonymous mystic work, written late in the fifteenth century, which he himself published before he had attacked the campaign of indulgence selling. It set off from a contrast between the "completely unified" (*vollkommen*) and the "parceled or broken" (*geteilt*). Luther might find in it many sympathetic passages ("We can of ourselves conceive nothing of good, but our perfection is of God," [9] for example), but Luther was no mystic, and he did not seize upon his solution in the mystic manner. His was a far simpler and less etherial personality, a disposition of childlike simpler and less etherial personality, a disposition of childlike piety in the form of his time,[10] which wished for nothing so much as to get his feet firmly on solid ground and walk—he did not aspire to fly through spheres of empty atmosphere. He found his assurance, not in a vision which would reveal, feature by feature, the face of God. He found simply a God who did not let men grope and stumble through a life of weakness and sin, to catch them up at the end with parental punishment of eternal duration. He was not a saint, or certainly a very fleshy and fleshly saint. He possessed the simplicity, the coarseness, the violence of temper, the stubbornness of a stock the virtues of which are seldom tried in complicated affairs. He was seldom cool, and far from always wise, but he did have courage to see through the vision that he had to its end; to energize better than to lead the forces which organized about him. And he did possess a mind which was so shot through with emotion that he understood nothing until he had made it his own, a temperament so open as to respond, upon the level where he met it, to much. And so his thought was original, comprehensive, vigorous. His solution of his personal problem did not only give him freedom. It gave him a great light, so deep in him and so simple that, so long as he trusted it, he could move about with his imagination all the forms and forces of society he understood, and frame of them a new vision of the European world. To be sure the matter was far less simple than he imagined it. Aiming to sanctify men to the task of being pious Christian citizens, and to sanctify the political and economic instruments of society, rather than a priesthood and a religious institution only, he soon discovered that these citizens, and these political and economic instruments did not easily acquire all the wished-for sanctity. But a new problem was posited. The face of a Europe hardly yet to be deeply and broadly moved save with a religious principle, was definitely set in a new direction.

---

[9] "Wir mogen von uns selber nichtss gutess gedencke, sunder unser vollkommenheit ift von got," *Ein Deutsch Theologia.*

[10] "Ein ernstgerichtetes in den Formen der Zeit kindlichfrommes Gemüt—so Benrath, *Luther im Kloster, 1505-1525,* describes Luther's religious disposition.

The incident which suddenly made of Luther a public character, and so set his vision and personality to work in the world, was more modestly conceived than later circumstances made it appear. Previous to his posting of the *theses against indulgences,* he had warned his hearers from the pulpit not to trust their salvation to purchased indulgences. It was the absurdly misleading statements of their vendors, whose rapacity papal decree had already condemned, that first drew his attention more generally to the whole question involved. The beginning of his conversion period was eight years behind him, and he has as yet disturbed no one by his teaching and preaching. The letter on indulgence which he, somewhat naïvely in view of the fact that it was written to the person who profited by their sale, addressed to the Archbishop of

Mainz probably mirrors the attitude which preceded the posting of his theses. He writes that Tetzel is telling people, "So soon as their money is cast into the chest" liberated souls fly immediately from Purgatory; and that, even though they had committed the impossible sin of "violating the Mother of God" one might with an indulgence be protected from punishment.[11] What bothers him is fear lest, so misled, people would cast aside pious fear, sin in security, and thus be turned from the narrow way leading to eternal life.

The whole question of indulgences left much ground for legitimate discussion by loyal churchmen. Its theory had received no authoritative form, and many practices could not be defended upon any theory anyone would have dared propose. Indeed, when Luther's attack had gotten under way, the chief salesman, Tetzel, was left without defenders in his attempt to justify himself; and when Luther's theses were examined by theologians, as bases for a heresy trial, the advice was that some only of his propositions should be proceeded against as heretical, the rest as *offensive to pious ears.*

The manner of attack he chose was a common method of initiating discussion among doctors and professors in the university. He posted on the church door, as on a university bulletin board, propositions concerning indulgences, offering to defend and asking discussion of them, as a means of arriving at the truth. They were drawn in Latin, and addressed to scholars and theologians. They were not, however, drawn in the usual professorial manner, but that they might serve both as teaching and warning against abuses of a practice Luther was not yet ready to condemn entire.

They stated that, when Christ exhorted Christians to repent, he referred, not to priestly confession and absolution but to sorrow for sin. Such a statement carried implications broader than the mere question of indulgences. The Church, he continues, can absolve from penance which the Church imposes, but this is not the same thing as pardon for sin, which God alone grants, and irrespective of indulgence. Therefore the Church's indulgence has no bearing upon purgatorial punishment, and cannot apply to the dead. The whole question of the *treasure of merit* is far from clear, he adds. Indeed the "true and precious" treasure of the Church is the Gospel, in which every Christian, without indulgence, has a part.

---

[11] ". . . etiam (ut aiunt) si per impossibile quis Matrem Dei violasset, quin possit solvi."

But this is not all he says. It should be known to Christians that the pope neither himself thought, nor wished Christians to believe, that purchasing indulgence was an act comparable in virtue to works of charity; and that if he knew of practices common in their sale, he would prefer to see the basilica of St. Peter in cinders, rather than built with "the skin, the flesh, and the bones of his sheep." Between properly respected rights of the pope to grant indulgence, and wild dreams and foolish words of those who bought and sold them, he drew a clear line.

His words struck fire in hearts that rejoiced and feared to hear him say what they thought. Publishers seized upon them for translation into the various popular tongues of Europe, and one printer made a small fortune circulating them. Students deserted other universities, to come to Wittenberg and hear Luther. His friends were frightened and kept silence. His distracted bishop could find nothing clearly heretical to condemn, but begged Luther to refrain from writing further on the subject. Leo X was inclined at first not to be disturbed. He was easy-going, an enlightened humanist, skeptical doubtless as to many practices which served him well, who probably considered indulgences first of all as a useful financial expedient. But Tetzel was immediately disturbed, for the bottom dropped out of his market, and the Archbishop of Mainz was disturbed, for he still owed money to the Fuggers, and indulgences had to sell.

It soon became evident that Luther's theses had committed the unpardonable sin of exerting tremendous popular influence, and that, unless he were silenced, nothing was safe for the Church in Germany, if anywhere indeed in Europe. Rome became excited, "many consistories, many consultations among cardinals and theologians" troubled the chambers of the pontiff.[12] A trap was laid to get Luther out of Germany, where it soon became unsafe to touch him. He who was sent to spring the trap was himself frightened on entering Germany to discover how great Luther's popular following had grown. Then the death of the emperor Maximilian placed Luther's princely protector in a still stronger position. The plan to capture him had failed, and the prevalent dissatisfaction had chosen its leader.

Luther could hardly have guessed dimly how far and fast events would carry him. But, under the protection of the Elector of Saxony, after the death of Maximilian for a time regent of the Empire, his pen was set to work, and he kept always a step or more in advance of his followers during these early years. The basis of assurance which he had found in himself became a hilltop, from which he surveyed the whole religious-political-social system inherited from the Middle Ages. He uttered no exalted prophecy, called upon his followers for no exalted flights. He became rather the voice of German piety and German patriotism, crystallizing long-standing German dislike for Italians, German revolt against a Church which, in its center of power, despised and exploited their simplicity, against the imperial phantom, linked in idea and also by necessity to the head of this Church; to aid also in setting peasants against princes and noble proprietors, princes against one another, against the emperor; to whet greed against monastic property, and liberate monks and nuns from vows no longer harmonious with new religious ideals, and thus suddenly changed from a staggering burden to an intolerable servitude; finally to set Protestant groups against one another, to smash, in a manner Luther never intended, not only remnants of the structure his imagination thought away when it was outworn, but even to tear apart, burn, almost obliterate in large parts of Germany, everything men had come to think of as civilization. Truly Luther might have said like Jesus, had he foreseen and dared so far, "I come not to bring peace, but a sword."

---

[12] Guicciardini, *Storia d'Italia,* XIII, v., "si facevano quell'anno (1520) a Roma spessi consistori, spesse consulte di cardinali e teologi deputati nella camera del pontifice, per trovare i remedi a questo male, che continuamente cresceva."

But this aftermath of his program Luther never intended. He saw the pope as the basis of impediment to a peaceful, pious Germany; strove to knit the people to their princes, the princes to religion and one another, and, fortunately for him, he died before the dyke burst, in 1546. "A child of God thrust into the midst of this world's affairs would have found it difficult to understand the years to come."[13] He left the immediate future but turmoil and many problems; the world his personality, and a vision he hardly knew how to handle, bewildered, angered, compromising, grasping wildly for peace, and misunderstood on every side.

He did, however, leave the world a vision which removed permanently, although not immediately in Catholic countries, the papacy as a dominant factor in civil society; and which also, when codified moral law had been substituted for the spiritual motive he imagined, and when finally humanly enacted law had been substituted for law which claimed divine foundation, was to present a tolerably respectable picture of nationalistic Europe.

Luther's program properly begins with his attack upon the medieval papacy. He did not, of course, question Christ's headship of Christendom, but soon came to question the pope's claim to represent upon earth this supreme sovereignty of Christ. This left the question already long disputed, whether Christ had divided his mundane sovereignty into two spheres, setting the successor of St. Peter as Christendom's spiritual head. At first Luther was disposed to grant the pope a supremacy in the Church, controlled by the conclusions of general councils, in which he would have gone no farther than the important councils of the early fifteenth century. But, taking the question of this papal supremacy to his Bible for study, and to the works of early Fathers, and armed beforehand with the conviction that God did not *save* Christians through the Church, he was able to discover enough landmarks of the gradual and factitious growth of the conception of papal supremacy, and its claimed inheritance from Christ, to doubt even here. Finally he concluded that papal supremacy in the Church derived, not from Christ, but from the will of Christians, who desired institutional and administrative unity.

---

[13] Lamprecht, *Deutsche Geschichte*,

Having gone so far he could not stop, for the entire papal power was organized on the other theory. The pope was neither Christ's agent in conferring human salvation, nor his appointed earthly vicar. What then might unseat him? There were two possibilities: either that the same Christians who had erected an ecclesiastical unity of which he was the head no longer desired a unity of this sort, or that the pope, discovered a heretic, be incapacitated to rule over Christians.

Luther's attack was based upon both these grounds, though his definite attack proceeded largely by the way of convicting the papacy of heresy.[14] But even earlier, as a wounded and patriotic German, he had criticized the papacy as a foreign institution that misused and ridiculed German simplicity: "At all times they have misused our simplicity as the servant of their arrogance and tyranny, calling us mad Dutchmen, at their will made fools and monkeys.[15] So, in fact, the two motives ran together—Germans no longer wanted to be made fools of by Italian popes, and Italian popes were heretics.

But Luther did not stop with seeping away the whole structure of the papacy, and in consequence the function of the Church as in medieval theory. At bottom Luther was of an obedient spirit. The natural originality of his mind, dealing with premises which he came to hold with deep conviction, shook him from a situation in which, probably, he might otherwise have remained an obedient monk. The obedience natural to his spirit he believed necessary to others, and to society. He was also respecter of authority. Something had to be done to replace the authority which he had stripped from the papacy. Luther laid it, for the far greater part, upon the shoulders of the princes, whom, in an eloquent tract, he exhorted to use it with Christian piety for the good of their subjects. None the less he reconstituted, in theory, the basis of authority of these princes. He emphasized in political rule, not right but duty. Princes were not so much set apart to exercise a hereditary power, as chosen to perform a particular function. If, he might have said, there was any divine right of princes, so, and in no different sense, there was a divine right of peasants, carpenters, and preachers. Luther had little to say which disturbed princely power, save to suggest that princes were princes because they ruled, and that they did not rule because they were princes. This distinction appeared to make no difference practically as to the legitimacy of their rule; nor was it the direction in which affairs were to move. Princes were soon to claim, more definitely and absolutely than before, the right to rule, just because they were princes, and were finally to be allowed to remain princes, just on condition that they should not undertake to rule. But here we are considering merely the social conception of Luther, which was as organic and functional as that of Paul, save that now the state itself was conceived, as Paul had not conceived it, as Christian.

---

[14] So his treatise on the *Babylonian Captivity of the Church* particularly.

[15] *An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation*, u. s. w.

The sphere of civil government even broadened under Luther's conception, to embrace things which had before been unquestioned prerogatives of the Church. Luther put under its charge all external aspects of the control of morals, the organized charitable care of the sick and unfortunate, and education, save where it was specifically religious.

What then, of all that the medieval Church had to care for, was left to the Church's superintendence? It was, as a separate social organization left little save such functions as were in the hands of the parochial clergy. There was no place left for monks, and they were soon advised to marry if they wanted to, and to attach themselves to some economic or social function. There was no essential hierarchy; merely such general administrative superintendence as practical organization made wise. About all that was left was a body of priests. But these priests were no longer conceived in the old sense, as divinely ordained persons. They were merely persons chosen by the body of Christians to exercise a particular class of social functions of religious nature. They were to be preachers and teachers of the *Word,* and administrants of the three sacraments, baptism, communion and penance, which

Luther left standing. But they were not in any necessarily exclusive sense set apart for the exercise of these functions, since in case of emergency or necessity any or all of their functions might be exercised by any Christian.

Luther's social conception is more than once summarized by him, in saying that the prince, the preacher, and the peasant, in Christian society, were but three Christians to whom, for the good of all, certain different functions were apportioned.

This program, when we get it sifted down to this, appears so simple, and in certain respects so modern, that we easily lose sight of its import. It would not be difficult to find its elements in different thinkers previously, and it even slips back toward some accents of medieval thought, and forward to some different accents of more modern implication, rather easily. It was none the less, in its comprehensiveness, its attitude, its emphasis, revolutionary. Men were not set, as in the Middle Ages, in a pattern presumably derived from a source outside society itself, but rather society spread itself, for its convenience, into a pattern, which for that reason might be conceived as alterable for the convenience of society.

Two things, however, we will note, as differentiating this pattern from that of contemporary society. First, it was a conception not less religious than the social conceptions of the Middle Ages. Second, Luther speaks but of the prince, the preacher, and the peasant, to whom certain functions were apportioned. The contemporary pattern was not complete until, as already suggested, *law* had taken the place and rôle of *religion,* as the basis of society, and until another class, which he does not even mention, had undertaken to apportion their functions to the prince, the preacher, and the peasant. The gradual subtle process of these alterations in Luther's program constitute an often hidden binding thread through the subsequent history of Christianity in Christendom. But for the moment it was into the control of other more immediate interests that the disturbance caused by Luther was to pass, and we must turn from him to see what happened in Germany when religious revolution was unleashed.

## XLIV

Luther's *Theses* were posted upon the church door at Wittenberg at the end of 1517 (All Saints' Eve). They raised their first storm of opposition with Tetzel, upon whose methods of selling indulgences they were a direct attack. But the Church authorities, even in Rome, were not disposed to support Tetzel, of whom indeed they might have made a convenient scapegoat. Tetzel was a Dominican, and his order took up the attack upon Luther, whose friends were inclined to keep silence, fearing the storm which gathered. In Rome Leo X at first considered the whole affair as a quarrel between the Augustinian and the Dominican monks, above which Brother Martin stood out as a distinguished spirit. Then, as Luther's criticism approached the person of Leo himself, he was called "a drunken Dutchman," with whom one must have patience until he had digested his liquor.

The emperor was still Maximilian, a good German, of soaring dreams in the manner of the declining chivalry, who has been called *the last knight*. Maximilian was no friend of the papacy, and indulged for a time the fancy of overturning it and uniting the overlordship of Church and State both in the person of himself, the emperor. So he looked upon the matter from the political angle, and he is reported to have remarked that "the monk Luther should be taken good care of, since an opportunity might arise when he would be useful." Luther's more immediate princely protector was Frederick the Wise, Elector of Saxony. The Elector Frederick was a sturdy pious soul. While praying God to keep him free from any stain of heresy, he none the less demanded for Luther a hearing. In fact what promised to be a hearing was arranged, first by sending from Rome an important cardinal (Cajetan, Cardinal of St. Sixtus). Luther was to meet Cajetan at Augsburg. He set out, a poor monk, as he later writes "without a penny."

> Dr. Wenselas Link lent me his cape for the journey, and I footed it to within three miles of Augsburg, then climbed upon a wagon and drove in, to take shelter in the Augustinian Monastery.

Luther was apparently of the opinion that he came for a discussion of his views, but this was by no means the cardinal's idea. Having arrived, Luther found that the emperor was off hunting, and waited several days without approaching the papal legate. In Weimar, as he journeyed, he had been warned of a possible trap.[1] The cardinal sent a servant to bid him come without fear, and another person whispered in his ear, "Don't believe him, he keeps faith with no one," which may have been an exaggeration, since it was, in form at least, only with heretics that cardinals were completely absolved from keeping faith.

The conference, however, came to nothing. Greeted first with friendly condescension, when Luther wished to discuss he was met by threats. Then another papal representative was sent to discuss the matter publicly with him at Leipzig. This debate brought no decision, and finished rather foolishly. In the meantime a campaign of pamphlets had begun, and in such a campaign Luther was bound to come off rather well. He punctuated a good deal of very clearly put argument with very cutting, though not always brightly polished, barbs. Then the Emperor Maximilian died, and the face of the affair was altered. Luther's protector, the Saxon Elector, became regent of the empire, and a very troublesome campaign began for the election of his successor. The pope rather preferred Francis I of France, the German Electors offered the throne to Frederick of Saxony, who felt himself too poor and not powerful enough to accept it, and the final choice fell upon Charles V, whose Hapsburg father had been both Archduke of Austria and ruler of the Netherlands when he married the mad queen of Spain, so that, before becoming emperor, Charles V already ruled in Austria, the Netherlands, Spain, parts of Italy, not to mention Spanish colonies in the New World.

It meant a great deal to a great many people that the new emperor should not be won to sympathetic interest in Luther. There was, to be sure, little sympathy between Charles and the pope in these early days of his reign. It was naturally not unknown to him that the papacy had favored the candidacy of Francis I. Moreover, even earlier the Curia had held out bait to tempt French armies into Italy against Hapsburg principalities. However, there was little danger that Charles would be won to Luther's ideas. For one thing, he knew nothing of Germany or Germans, whose language even he could but imperfectly understand or speak. The Lutheran agitation lingered for a time a matter of discussion, which grew into a broad popular movement, such that Rome was obliged to meet it with a definite bull excommunicating Luther. This bull Luther burned, along with the accepted books of canon law, in a spectacular bonfire, amid public enthusiasm. But, to lay hands upon Luther in Germany was impossible. His prince and the people were too solidly around him.

---

[1] Myconius, *Geschichte der Reformation* (1541).

Early in 1521 (March) the emperor came to Worms, to hold his first imperial diet. It was arranged that Luther should appear before him there, with a safe-conduct from the emperor. When Luther set out for Worms it was no longer as on that former journey to Augsburg. "As he drew near a town, the people rushed from the city to meet him, eager to look upon the prodigy, who had stood so bravely against the pope and the whole world." [2] As a herald led him through the Thuringian city of Gotha "the Devil tore out some stones from the church-steeple after the preaching." [3] The powers of earth, air, heaven and underworld were allied in groups, for or against him.

> The Emperor sat in majesty, surrounded by the electors, princes, bishops and prelates of the realm. About him stood the counts, the nobles, and the knights. As Luther approached there was such a crowd that room had to be made for him with staves and halberds, so that he might draw near the emperor's throne. There were four cardinals and legates present, all of whom thirsted for Luther's blood, not to mention

---

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.* (Gotha was Myconius' home town).

> the other legates, and the uncounted number of commons and scholars. And, as Luther stood there, looking for the first time in his life upon his Imperial Majesty, all believed that he would be so overawed that he would be unable to speak.[4]

Luther spoke, none the less, in German, and then when the emperor could understand him but imperfectly, in Latin. He had not been brought there to see his case considered, but to be overawed. It was a dangerous situation. He had, to be sure, the emperor's guarantee of safety, but Huss had had as much at Constance, and it had not saved him.

But Luther had gone to Worms, prepared to die if that was to be his fate. More complicated was the position of his protector, the Elector of Saxony. However, just as it had pleased Charles for the moment to please the pope, by summoning Luther, so it did not please him to allow the pope to lay hands upon him just then. When no retraction could be forced from Luther, he was dismissed, and when he had left the city an imperial edict was issued to trail behind him, making him an outlaw the moment his safe-conduct had expired. Luther's safety thus rested upon Frederick, who might well hesitate to defy the emperor. He hit upon a brilliant stroke, which at the same time made it possible for Charles to please the pope by outlawing him, and temporize so far as more definite action was concerned. While Luther traversed the elector's territory, on his way home to Wittenberg, Frederick arranged to have him kidnaped, not many miles from one of his castles. Then in the Wartburg, near Eistenach, known to the castle personnel one as Junker Jürgen, and for a short time at least not himself knowing where he was,[5] he lived for months. The emperor himself did not know, apparently did not want to know, his hiding place.[6] People generally believed him dead, and the painter Albrecht Dürer wrote to a friend:

> O God, Luther is dead! Who now will with such clarity set forth

---

[4] Again from Myconius.

[5] "Ich lass mich einthun und verbergen, weiss nicht selbst wo." Letter of Luther to Cranach.

[6] "Der Kaiser wollte daher den Aufenthantsort Luthers selbst nicht wissen." Von Hase, *Kirchengeschichte,* III, 1, 66.

the Gospel for us? How much might he not have written in another ten or twenty years!

The prisoner himself was by no means pleased at this enforced inactivity. Before he had been two weeks in the Wartburg he wrote to his friend Melancthon:

> Greetings! What are you doing, my Philip, meanwhile? Or are you praying for me, that my absence, to which reluctantly only I have reconciled myself, may work some great thing to the glory of God. . . . I have no greater wish than to counter the fury of my antagonists with the offering of my neck.[7]

Deprived of this possibility, Luther sat down in the comfortable though contracted chamber assigned him, to translate the Bible into German, and to continue his pamphlet campaign. The times were rough, Germans had the reputation of being a little rougher than the times, Luther had little of even German polish. His pen was pungent, and what he sometimes wrote sounds to less robust ears to-day not far from scurrilous.

Melancthon, upon whom as Luther's friend of the right hand leadership had descended, was a very different sort of person. He was intellectually keen, more subtle and pliable than Luther, given to fright and fluttering when emergency pressed. In Wittenberg the movement escaped from his hands, and the students took to reforming things themselves. A mob burst into the church, removed the liturgical books and drove out the officiating priests. They ate meat conspicuously on fast days, avoided confession, destroyed devotional pictures, and taught that people who did such things were the true Christians. Then the spirit of prophecy arose, rejecting the Bible, upon which Luther's faith was so firmly pinned, from the belief that, had God wished mankind to be taught by a book, he would have sent them one direct from heaven. Karlstadt, one of Luther's fellow professors in the university, who had been closely associated with him in reform, laid aside the title of doctor, dismissed his classes, telling the students to go home and till the land. The rector of the boys' school threw the schoolbooks out of the window, advising the parents of the pupils to take them out of school, since henceforth everyone was to be taught by God directly. Adherents of the prophetic school turned their attention to the Apocalypse (Book of Revelations), predicting from its pages a bloody revolution of the Church. Melancthon was affected by their arguments. The Elector of Saxony hesitated to oppose them, lest unknowingly he might fight against God.

---

[7] Letter dated from the Wartburg, May 10, 1521.

Such a movement was no part of Luther's program. At the beginning of these disturbances in Wittenberg he was greatly disturbed, indeed to such extent that he abruptly left the Wartburg, without asking permission, and returned to Wittenberg. Here, in a series of sermons, he won back the city, and those leaders of the new movement who were unwilling to reform his way departed for other fields of activity, which were soon to open up.

Departing as he did, without the elector's knowledge, when he had enjoyed his protection, Luther felt the obligation to explain his conduct, and to free Frederick from all responsibility for his act or his further safety. He wrote him a letter which stands out as probably the most famous of the many he wrote. We cannot quote it in full, but there are phrases of great importance as interpreting his character.

> What I have written is written from deep concern, and wish to bring consolation to Your Highness; not for my own interest . . . but on account of the clumsy turn of affairs at Wittenberg, which has arisen for the great discomfiture of the Gospel, through the acts of our own party. I feared that, in consequence of these acts, a heavy burden might be put upon Your Highness.
>
> Then, too, the calamity has so chafed me that, were I not certain that we possessed the genuine Gospel, I might have despaired as to the whole business. All that I have accomplished up to now, at cost of my own suffering, has become insignificant foolishness. I have even wished, if that might have been, to have bought it off at cost of my life.
>
> Your Highness knows, and if he does not I here make it known to him, that the Gospel I have not from men, but from Heaven alone, through our Lord Jesus Christ. . . . If I have offered myself for interrogation, and to judgment, it was not done as doubting of my calling, but rather from too great humility, wishing in this way to persuade others. But now, perceiving that my too great humility has worked to humble

> the Gospel; since I see that the Devil, given a handsbreadth wishes now to usurp the whole place, I am obliged by this knowledge to do something more and different.
>
> (Then he continues to absolve the Elector from further responsibility for his safety, having by his action rendered such protection a more difficult matter, and adds) . . . I go to Wittenberg under a protection far higher than that of an Elector. . . . Moreover, did I know that Your Highness could and would protect me, I should not come. In this emergency no sword can or should advise or assist. Here must God alone shape affairs, without human activity or concern.

Returned to Wittenberg, the active and acknowledged leader of the whole movement of religious reform in Germany, Luther was soon to be presented with a problem of revolution far more important than what he had dealt with in Wittenberg. In the middle of 1524, from a trivial incident that occurred upon the estate of a single noble, a revolt of the peasantry arose, which spread broadly through the south of Germany and attracted to it leaders of the radical religious wing which Luther had opposed in his own city.

There had been peasant revolts as early as 1490, and it was in 1493 that the *Bundschuh* had been adopted as the emblem and standard of uprising. The movement was part of the whole process of economic and social change; a symptom of unrest that touched all classes. Its causes were manifold and complex, its history full and varied, and we can hope to sketch neither here. It was however a tragic turning point of the Reformation, which cannot be passed by without attention.

The situation of the peasantry in Germany differed in different parts. The economic pressure upon the landlord class was bound in ways to be passed on to them where possible. But it is probably a mistake to consider the German peasantry at the beginning of the sixteenth century as either a particularly oppressed or unhappy class.[8] From the end of the fifteenth century their desire to ape the fashions of more exalted social classes was satirized.[9] About 1500 one might read:

---

[8] "Es gabe jedoch sin falsches Bild, wollte man sich die Bauern dieser Zeit als ein halbverhungertes und verelendetes Proletariat vorsettlen. Ihre materielle Lage war oft gar nicht schlecht, manchmal besser als die der Ritter auf den Burgen." Kaulfuss-Deisch, *Das Buch der Reformation,* 90.

[9] By Sebastian Brant for example.

> Often in peasant's houses one finds the foreign wares the merchants are bringing in, for the most part useless and unhealthy.[10]

Again one reads, from a poet of the burgher class:

Die Bauern wollen nicht vertragen
Dass die Ritter und ihre Kind,
Anders denn sie gekliedet sind . . .
Die Bauernschaft hoch steiget,
Die Ritterschaft nieder neiget . . .
Hievor in kurzen Yahren
War kein Bauer also reich . . .

Peasants were unwilling to dress otherwise than the knights, were on the rise, while the knights tended in the contrary direction. These *Bauern* combed and parted their hair, wore clothing chosen rather for style than free movement, had their shoes cut out "in courtly fashion," that their stockings might be seen, donned spurs, and sang dance songs. In consequence Lucifer, in whose mouth these words are put, predicts continual difficulty between peasant and knight:

Aber von diesen Tagen
Soll auf dieser Erden
Nimmer kein rechter Friede werden
Zwischen den Bauern und der Ritterstand.[11]

Religion was soon brought to the assistance of the oppressed and the ambitious peasants, by radical preachers, of whom the most important in Luther's own Thuringia was one Thomas Münzer. The Bible might be used to great advantage, and Münzer interlarded tirades against the nobles with authoritative references:

> If you will not humble yourself before the common people (*den Kleinen*), infamy will fall upon your neck before the eyes of Christendom; you will become the Devil's martyr. And that you may know that we have sufficient authority, I say to you, that the ever-living God had given the command, laying upon us the duty of overturning you by force from your throne. . . . God has spoken of you and your like, Ezekiel 34

[10] Von Gleichen-Russwurm, *Gottische Welt,* 283.
[11] *Grosses Neithardspiel.*

> and 39, Daniel 7, and Matthew 3. ". . . Fear and trembling be to everyone who worketh evil" (Romans 2). . . . "Think you that the Lord God cannot raise up his ignorant people to overturn, in his anger, all tyranny?" (Hosea 8 and 13). "Has not the mother of Christ spoken of you and of your like, through the Holy Spirit, prophesying?" (Luke 1. . . . (Signed) Thomas Münzer with the sword of Gideon.[12]

Into this strife Luther was immediately called. Himself of peasant stock, he was naturally looked to for aid, but this was not at all the revolution he had planned. As formerly he had raged against the outburst of free prophecy at Wittenberg, exclaiming, "As for your prophetic spirit, I smash it on the snout" (*Euer Geist haue ich auf die Schnauzen*), so now, after an initial attempt at conciliation, he threw the weight of his authority to the side of the princes, and laid about in no gentle fashion, to himself quote Scripture against the false spirits who were inciting the peasants to social disorder.

> It is of no use to the peasants to quote I Moses, I, 28, and II, 5, to the effect that all things should be free and held in common, and that all have received the same baptism. In the New Testament Moses has no authority, but it stands under Master Christ . . . who speaks, Matthew XXII, 2, "Give to Cæsar what is Cæsar's." So also says Paul, Romans XXXI. 1 . . . and Peter, First Epistle II. 13. . . . For baptism does not make body and property free, but the soul.[13]

And so, against the peasants in Thuringia, and with Luther's blessing, "Duke John of Saxony, Duke George of Saxony, Landgrave Philip of Hesse, and Duke Henry of Brunswick" set off with fifteen hundred mounted knights and many foot soldiers. There was much parley before the battle, and then, when the attack began, "the poor peasants stood singing '*Nun bitten wir den heiligen Geist,*' as though gone crazy, giving themselves neither to self-defense nor flight," and many expecting a miracle which would come, at the bidding of Münzer, to preserve them.[14] There were many slaughtered, here and elsewhere, ere the Peasants' Revolt was quelled, and Luther added an aftermath, an admonition to the effect that the triumphant princes should not assume that their victory was a proof of God's approval, since it was more probable that they had been merely God's instrument for the punishment of the unruly peasants—*"Gott helfe unds bald zum seligen Frieden. Amen."* [15]

---

[12] From letters to Ernest of Heldrungen and Albert of Mansfeld.

[13] From Luther's *Wider die räuberischen und mörderischen Bauern.*

[14] *Die Sclacht bei Frankenhausen* (a contemporary account, quoted from Kaulfuss-Diesch, *Das Buch der Reformation*).

The peace for which Luther prayed was not, however, to come quickly, and there were other unruly radical movements. The plea for the common ownership of property, after the example of the early Christians in Jerusalem, was not limited to the peasants. Later, more particularly in the north of Germany, arose a sect which also believed that with the assistance of community of property the Kingdom of Heaven might be set up immediately upon earth. First, however, rebaptism was necessary, from which they were called Anabaptists (*Wiedertäufer*). In Münster this experiment was tried out most fully, the Anabaptists obtaining for a time control of the city. Zealots ran about the streets crying, "Out you godless, God will awake and punish you!" They burst in the doors of houses, and chased from the cities those who would not be rebaptized. A burlesque mass was held in the Cathedral, at which the king's fool officiated, after which the people brought their offerings, "cats, dogs, rats, mice, bats and bones," while the crowd stood by and laughed heartily.[16] But the experiment was not a success. While an army besieged the city people all but starved,[17] and the city once captured returned to the ranks of Catholicism, while the bodies of their leaders, Knipperdolling and Krechting, hung for long in cages from the church steeple. *"Was einen raren Tanz habt ihr gehalten!"* exclaims the eyewitness in conclusion.

Such were the anarchistic and impatient revolutionary movements unleashed when it suddenly became possible to believe, not as a single and lonely speculative dreamer, who dared scarcely tell his dreams, but elbow to elbow with a considerable and comforting mass of like-minded persons, that all one ever had dreamed of or might wish for was about to come to pass. Heresy had laid a hand, not only upon the prerogatives of a religious institution, in an attempt to win salvation after death, but upon the social order, aiming to pitch the Middle Ages out of an alley window, and move in Heaven at the front door. Utopias, planned quite differently by Thomas More and Machiavelli (not to mention others), were being taken seriously by masses of the common people, upon whose generally patient inarticulate acceptance of the medieval order the social stability of Christendom had rested for centuries. The movements were suppressed. The Peasants' Revolt ended with the economic situation of this class in Germany rather worse than better than it had been. All that was left of the Anabaptists when Christendom left them at peace, were such socially harmless sects as the Mennonites and Baptists. But, for all the victims, probably more in number than those of the Inquisition, one may well ask whether the aspiration ever was suppressed entirely. It would be untrue to the facts to claim that the Middle Ages had not taken account of or considered the common man, but certainly they did not take account of him with a view to a change for the better in his economic or social condition as a mass. Here, with the inspiration of religion, the common man had attempted to arrange his heaven for himself, and henceforth in Christendom there was to be the problem of suppressing, ordering, prudently feeding, or acquiring by sale and purchase, this aspiration.

---

[15] "Ein Schrecklich geschicht und gericht Gottes über Thomas Münzer, darinnen Gott offentlich desselbigen ganst lügen strafft und verdammet." Pamphlet of Luther.

[16] Meister Heinrich Gresbeck's *Bericht von der Wiedertäufer in Münster.*

[17] ". . . da ging das Volk so jammerlich auf den Strassen . . . als wenn sie vom Tode aus dem Grabe auferstanden waren, und sahen von Angesicht aus wie ein Todenhemd, und war nur die Unterschied zwischen beiden, dass das Leben noch in den Wiedertäufer war und dass der Hut noch um das Hemd und um der Leichnam."

In lending his approval to the suppression of the Peasants Revolt Luther earned a new class of enemies. It was difficult to forgive him for this unwillingness to link himself to the aspirations of the class in which he was born. It has been difficult for many in later centuries to forgive him, but into such discussion as this question tempts we need not enter. That in disapproving the actions of the revolting peasants he was consistent with his vision of Christian society it is hardly possible to doubt. Whether the attitude toward the revolt into which he settled was either Christian or statesmanlike is another question. In effect he threw the reins to the princes, and bade them drive, in a situation the practical currents of which he no longer controlled, hoping that these princes would lead the people in the way he believed they should go—hoping, prayerfully no doubt, but at bottom unable to do otherwise.

Indeed it soon became evident that, while Luther might be counted upon to stand courageously against any attempt to back him out of the position into which he had entered, it was almost equally impossible to fit him into new situations, not comprehended in his pattern, which began to arise. This inflexibility, so important to the success of the Reformation at its beginning, became painfully apparent as early as 1529, when one of the important German princes arranged a meeting between Luther, with some of his lieutenants, and the Swiss theologian and reform leader, Zwingli, at Marburg.

As a matter of fact the split between Luther and Zwingli represented something more than a matter of theological difference of opinion, as we shall see in returning to Zwingli later on, to note how he links with the Calvinist temper in the religious revolution. But for the moment it was a question of theology merely, and the cold reason with which Zwingli turned the diaphanous garments of the sacrament into hard transparent glass, through which one saw the kernel of the eucharist as a comforting and sociable symbol and memorial, was as uncongenial to him as the boiling prophecy which spurned pulpits, and predicted apocalyptic struggles against Antichrist in the public squares. The conference arranged at Marburg was an attempt to reconcile, on some basis of friendly coöperation, two important wings of developing reform. Everyone who took part, even Luther in intention, was for conciliation, and some sort of a working basis which, while not necessarily involving assent to identical theological formulas, might join the more stable Protestant forces. But conviction such as Luther's is obliged to pay its price. When the question arose as to whether or not the body and blood of Christ were really present in the eucharist, Luther turned to his Bible, where he read the words, "This is my body," and on these words he stood firmly immovable. Yet Luther had not been an entirely servile reader of his Bible. One suspects that here he was (and here certainly he does not stand alone) using the Bible to his purpose; for to Luther it was inevitably easier to find God in a sanctified *wafer* than in a glorified *decalogue.* The Marburg conference was a failure, and in the words with which Luther dismissed the possibility of coöperation there seems a touch of melancholy:

> I am neither your lord, your judge, nor your teacher; our spirits do not fit together; it is indeed but too evident that we do not possess one spirit. For that cannot be one and the same spirit which in one place believes in the word of God simply, and in another criticizes the same sort of faith, opposes it, judges it false, touches it with all sorts of outrageous abuse. Therefore, as I have already said, we commend you to the judgment of God. Continue to teach according as you wish to be answerable to God.[18]

The Reformation had become, from the Diet of Worms, even more clearly after the Peasants' Revolt, a matter of German politics, only pushed from the more conspicuous center of the stage by the complicated political problems of Charles V, which never became so simple as to allow him to deal definitely and simply with it. But finally, in 1530, a year after Protestantism had gained its name, from the presentation of a *protest* at a diet held in *Spires,* the emperor again gathered the princes and dignitaries together at Augsburg for a conference upon the question of religious reform.

Charles had by now decided that in the matter of the Reformation his most important interests lay upon the side of the pope. He had already atempted to drive a wedge into the middle of the evangelical movement, by decreeing that Catholicism should be tolerated in Protestant states, Lutheranism should not be tolerated in Catholic states, and that Zwinglianism and the radical doctrines of Anabaptists should not be tolerated anywhere in the empire. He had now called upon the Lutherans to present to him, at the Diet of Augsburg, their confession of faith, for discussion and decision. The Lutherans knew that the hands of the emperor were now free to deal with them, and their *Confession* was drawn such as to emphasize as little as possible differences of doctrine in less important places. Luther, whose safety it was impossible to assure, went to Gotha and remained there behind castle walls. This left Melancthon the leader among the Protestant theologians. Melancthon was modest of speech [19] and conciliating of temper, and was indeed later for a moment in danger of being stampeded into dangerous concessions. As for the emperor, the papal legate had ridden at his side on the journey to Augsburg, urging him to coercion. Charles was an excellent listener, with a great gift of holding his tongue and avoiding precipitate action. He doubtless had not yet made up his mind just what course to pursue; but the arrival of the reformers brought something into the atmosphere that he sensed. He immediately forbade public preaching (an order by no mean strictly obeyed), and at first opposed the public reading of the *Confession* in German, on the ground that he understood the language but imperfectly. Finally he consented to a reading at a private session, whereupon the Herr Chancellor read it "so well, and so loud and clear that it was heard, not only in the hall, but below in the court." [20]

---

[18] From Osiander's account of the Marburg Conference.

This *Confession* had been signed by the Elector of Saxony (son of Luther's earlier protector), the Mark of Brandenburg, the Duke of Luneburg, the Langrave of Hesse, the Duke of Saxony, the Prince of Anhalt, the Senate and Magistrate of Nüremberg, the Senate of Reutlingen, an imposing list. Zwingli had himself sent a more radical confession to the emperor, the cities of Strassburg, Constance and Memmingen had united in sending still a third.

---

[19] "Er war bescheidener mit seiner Rede, als ich je einen Lutherischen gehört habe." Charity Pirckheimer's comment upon Melancthon after an interview with him.

[20] Spalatin's *Annales*.

Neither side wished to be involved in mutual war. In fact the emperor hoped to gain the assistance of the Protestant princes for a war against the Turks. When he broached the subject he was advised that religious matters must first be decided. The Reformation had become politically formidable, and its princely defenders were more decided even than the theologians. "Some tyrants . . . busied themselves to the end that the Protestant princes be craftily bidden to the emperor's chamber, seized and beheaded." [21] Whether or not the emperor gave secret orders to that effect is uncertain, but Philip of Hesse, his request to be allowed to depart not granted, slipped out of the city gate unrecognized, and followed by some of his retainers. His departure left the most aggressive of these princes free, and such procedure more dangerous than it would have been before. Melancthon made almost frantic efforts to meet the demands of the Catholics. The Elector of Saxony declared that neither emperor, empire, or any man could move him to betray *"lieber Gott und Herr Christ."* The Protestants departed, to leave the Catholics to arrange a court for the protection of church property against Protestant seizure, against which in turn the Protestant princes formed the *Schmalkald League,* which was to prepare a bitterer struggle later on, a temporary victory for the emperor, numerous attempts to settle the matter diplomatically, more than twenty years of political unrest and violence, a new emperor, new policies, and finally the Thirty Years War.

We may, however, leave the political aspect of the Reformation, saved in a measure by the flight of Philip of Hesse from Augsburg in August, 1530, to trace it, in a more permanent influence, among the people of the middle or burgher class.

"Who is supreme in authority among the people?" asks a character in a dialogue of Hans Sachs, the literary mouthpiece of this class in the early years of the Reformation. "Is it not the emperor, and after him the princes?" A second character, a canon, answers that it is the pope. But the first character, a shoemaker (Sachs, a shoemaker, speaks here in his own person), answers that the pope is but the servant of the Christian community, which leads to the quotation of Biblical authorities, while the canon reflects that so soon as a Lutheran learns a verse or two from the Bible he goes about vexing everyone with it. Even the canon's servant is struck with astonishment at the cleverness of the laity in argument. "Would you know why?" asks the canon. "It is because the clergy no longer count for anything." [22] Then he bids the servant (his cook) call the porter, who straightway begins to quote Scripture, and is vigorously fired:

---

[21] Myconius, *Geschichte der Reformation.*

> Bist auch der Lutherischen einer? Troll dich nur pald aus dem hauss und komm nit wider, du unverschamtes thyer.[23]

While the religious revolution of the sixteenth century was hardly to weaken political authority, it worked a great liberation of the middle-class piety. A class which had been described as having been much given to hearing and providing masses, nourishing many monks and clerics,[24] had no sooner Bibles than they began to discover what they did, and what they did not want in the way of religious authority, or of religious institution. Among the first things they decided they did not want to support were monks and nuns. In another dialogue, Hans Sachs offers one of these monks an ax, that he may go and cut wood and make himself useful. So also might he learn to become obedient toward all men and experience the genuine poverty.[25]

But monks and nuns were not the only class who now might be expected to conduct themselves modestly and make themselves useful. Princes, whether lay or clerical, who wrung money from whence they could, often relentlessly, also dispensed it with what easily seemed to prudent burghers great carelessness as to the solid advantages such expenditures might buy. They did not, for example, hire, but they fed, supported, housed, even honored artists. Another spirit arose among the rich burghers, even when they began to dispense their growing affluence for art. Albrecht Dürer, Germany's greatest painter of the period, noted immediately a difference when he crossed the Alps to Venice.

---

[22] "Mich nymbt gross wunder, wie die leyen so geschict werden. . . . Wilt wissen was macht? Man gibt umb die geistlikeit nichts mehr."

[23] *Disputation zwischen einem Chorherrn und Schumacher*—Hans Sachs (1524).

[24] Sebastian Franck, *Weltbuch,* u. s. w.

[25] Sachs, *Eyn gesprech von den Scheinwercken der Gaystlichen und jren gelübten.*

> How shall I freeze at home, after basking in this sunshine! Here I am a lord, at home merely a sponger.[26]

So he wrote home to a friend. These German merchants were accustomed to buy what they wanted, and they bought their art to order, demanding themselves to be put into pictures for which their purses paid, when they were set in churches for public gazing, with their wives, their children, even their favorite dogs, along with Christ, Virgin, Apostles or saints. Nor was this all. Beginning first by substituting, in paintings of religous subject, contemporary religious leaders for characters long since dead (a Protestant prince might appear as Christ in the *Last Supper,* with Luther, Melancthon and others dressed as his Apostles), they came in time to be put in themselves, as donors of the picture, and with their relatives, as personages in the sacred scene presented. The imagination of artists had become a little worn in portraying saintly character, and such portraits might furnish an element of fresh interest to old subjects; but from the standpoint of religious impulses as expressed in art such substitution furnishes food for reflection.

However, long before the Reformation, the bloom had passed in religious art everywhere in Europe. The twisted eccentricities, the expressive individualizations of the Romanesque had not been entirely eliminated from hidden places and less important subjects in the formalized Gothic, before the serene and majestic classic dignity of thirteenth-century masterpieces was hardening into types, still dignified, but hardly less cold than a scholastic syllogism. Breaking away from this the artists were forced to seek less lofty themes, to find some new grace in movement which might drift to the side of coquetry or dramatic pathos, straining away, in sculpture, toward the picturesque. But, falling still lower in adherence to traditional themes, it went often toward the richly frivolous, a frivolity sometimes of sumptuous magnificence, often of mere ornate vulgarity. In consequence, when the new religious art touched subjects in which elements of homely and pedestrian sentiment were at home, it was enriched. In the "Nativity" one did not assist, awestruck in contemplation, at the miraculous birth of a divine infant; but one might see the swaddling-clothes warmed at the hearth, maids handy with ewer and basin for the infant's washing, in a bourgeois chamber fitted generously with heavy carved chests and other furniture, cheerful and sumptuous with silver and copper vessels, which showed the virgin mother to be an excellent *Hausfrau,* who had taken care, even to the eve of her wondrous infant's birth, that all the furniture was dustless, and that the vessels were bravely polished.

---

[26] "O wie wird mich nach der Sonne frieren! Hier bin ich ein Herr, daheim ein Schmarotzer."

Literature particularly was stimulated. Hans Sachs greeted Luther's coming in a joyous poem of some seven hundred lines:

Wacht auf, es nahet gen dem Tag,
Ich hör singen im grünen Hag
Ein wonnigliche Nactigall.
Ihr Stimm durchklinget Berg und Thal.
Die Nacht neigt sich gen Occident,
Der Tag geht auf vom Orient,
Die rothbrünstige Morgenroth
Her durch die trüben Wolken geht.[27]

Sachs cobbled and poetized with equal industry, turning out some six thousand poems, dramas, and miscellaneous literary products, that found their inspiration largely in burgher life, burgher sentiment, and burgher virtue. He pictured the tender faithful love of affianced young people, devoted marital fidelity conquering difficulties. He portrays paternal and filial affection, patience, obedience, industry, simple trust in God. The virtues hug the hearthstone and the pavement, as does on the whole the literary style. Comedy and satire flourished best, inspired largely by religious controversy awakened. The spoken language was pungent with the odor of stables and city gutters. It spoke of life in natural terms derived from a condition in which there was little room for privacy even at most intimate moments. Luther and Sachs had this language at their command. Others slung it, like handfuls of filth, in satire. It should not be forgotten that, during the Middle Ages few literary products save those of court and cloister attained permanent form. The art of printing made possible a literature for popular reading, opening a mine of material before but little used; while at the same time courtly literature, save where Humanism revivified it with influence from the classics, had gone to seed in its own refinements.[28]

---

[27] Awake, the day draws near,
For singing in the grove I hear
A joyous nightingale.
Its voice resounds through hill and dale.
Into the west the night declines,
As from the east the daybreak shines,
While the ardent morning red
Through the dun clouds breaks instead.

In the literary liberation of the kitchen sink, and in the inspiration of Lutheran piety, rather than in Humanism, lay the vigor of German literature during this period. Many Protestant hymn writers turned out rhymed doctrine or diminutive homilies in verse, but Luther contributed—

Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott,
Ein' gute Wehr und Waffen . . .

a firm clenched fist in every word. Out of the later anguish of the Thirty Years War Paul Gerhard wrote:

Fahr hin, ein' andre Sonne,
mein Jesus, meine Wonne,
gar hell in meinem Herzen scheint.

An unknown poet metamorphosed the theme of the *Dance of Death.* Death becomes a mower in a field and garden of the fairest flowers

---

[28] In France, for example, the talented, sensitive and high-minded Charles d'Orléans may here be compared, on the one hand with Villon, on the other with Marot or Ronsard.

. . . die silbernen Glocken,
die goldenen Flocken,
senkt alles zur Erden,
was wird nur draus werden?
Hüte dich, schöns Blümelein!

But the *dénouement* has partaken of the liberation of Luther's conversion:

Trutz! Tod, komm her, ich fürcht dich nit.
Trutz! Komm und tu ein Schnitt.
Wenn er mich verletzet,
so werd ich versetzet,
ich will es erwarten
in den himmlichen Garten,
Freu dich, du schöns Blümelein![29]

In all this, however, it seemed to some that the saints were being brought down to earth in too unequivocal fashion. They might be found in places where Luther himself would never have thought to look. This situation brought disillusion to the heart of one German theologian, acting with Luther at the beginning of the movement.

> Most of the evangelicals despise authority, humble the poor, oppress the weak, practice usury, rob, pillage, and give themselves up to debauchery; all likewise enchanted to hear . . . that we are justified solely because God accounts us justified, although we may be the worst rascals in the world. . . . That doctrine is reasurring, and thanks to it one may believe himself a saint while remaining a criminal.

This, according to Herr Doctor Osiander, was the result of letting down the bars in the matter of saintliness. And in conclusion let us turn to a prophetic bit from a German poet of the second half of the sixteenth century, that we may glimpse the popularization of another of Luther's doctrines, which aimed to establish the authority of princes, as the world turned from the picturesque toward the solidly useful.

---

[29] To translate such a lyric passage serves but little. It says, first that the silver bells and golden phlox were sinking to the earth, and what was to become of them? Then, that the flowers need not fear, but rather rejoice, since they were but to be transplanted into the heavenly garden.

In 1595 appeared a fable in verse, by the poet Georg Rollenhagen, entitled *Der Froschmeuseler,* War of the Frogs and Mice. It tells, in one incident, of how the frogs, who represented satirically the knights, were terrified by a great storm, and after that a cloudburst, all so augustly impressive that they concluded it must announce the coming of a king to rule over them. Finally, when the storm had cleared they spied a *log,* with a hole in each of its arms, an immense mouth in its neck, a thick, gray and round body, naked, and without crown or scepter. None dared go near enough to address this new monarch, until finally one, younger and rasher than the others, approached, kissed the lower extremities of the divinely sent, and demanded his recompense, as first to hail him. Then this rash little frog discovered that this formidable-appearing figure was really helpless, climbed upon its back, and the others drew around.

> "Quad, quad," sprachen sie, "quad, quad, quad,
> Bei solchem könig ist kein rat!"
> Dass war der dank, den Gott bekam,
> Als der bloch die herschaft annam.[30]

After some discussion they hauled the log ashore, got a peasant, who loaded it on his drag, tugged it home, dried it thoroughly, so that it might serve as a barrel, or some other useful purpose. Then came two kings with his nobles from another land, who gave it due honor, swore fidelity, with all their followers, built their shelters about it and took up residence. For these new subjects were bees, and they brought much honey, and the more honey they brought the more King Log was honored by them. As for the frogs, who would not accept King Log, they got King Stork instead, who ate them when he was hungry and it pleased him.

Such was the fable which takes us far on our way, into and through the seventeenth century with the divine right of kings. In France the frogs were to get King Stork, to eat them so agreeably that they quite imagined that they themselves were feasting.

---

[30] "Coax, coax, such a king has no good advice to give!" So they said, and this was the thanks God received when King Log took up his sovereignty.

But in England King Log was in the end to come into his own.

Die bienmenlein
Fürten so viel des honigs ein
Und merten sich von tag zu tag,
Das der hof all voll bienen lag
Und der man daraus löset geld,
Sein haushalten gar wol bestellt.
Wer gottes gab helt lieb und wert,
Dem ist segen und gnad beschert;
Wer aber gottes gnad veracht,
Der hat sich selbst zum fluch gemacht.[31]

So, in the end, while Luther may have seemed to have done two antagonistic things, in handing power to princes and religion to the middle class, there was a way of resolving this apparent antithesis, and the way was to be discovered in due time.

---

[31] The little Beemen brought in more and more honey, and became more and more from day to day, until the court was full of Beemen, and the Log's proprietor made much money out of the situation. For he who appreciates God's blessings receives blessing and honor, but he who desires them draws down a curse upon himself.

# XLV

> There was a garden spot hedged about on one side by high mountains, on another by gurgling streams, and in it roamed, cropping the green blades of grass, a fine fat bullock of ruddy hue, with widespread horns and on his brow rich waving hair.[1]

So in a fable, is Switzerland described, beast by the snares and wiles of the Lion (The Emperor), the Leopard (France), and the Fox (Venice).

> I rather think the Ox will get a fine beating now, unless he is saved by the protecting staff of the Herdsman (the Pope), or unless the Leopard and the Lion fall out, or the variegated one (Leopard) brings gifts of reconciliation, but then the Herdsman will be angry.

With the reflection the fable comes to an end. It rather clearly suggests, even in such brief quotation, that Switzerland had such a troublous time maintaining her freedom that, if she at all took pains to remain independent, her independence must have seemed to her worth the trouble.

The Herdsman had, to be sure, a special interest in the Ox; that is to say, leaving the fable, the pope drew many mercenary soldiers from Switzerland, and scattered pensions about, from his usually ample purse, to certain persons whom he believed of assistance in procuring these sometimes necessary adjuncts of papal power.

When Zwingli, the author of the fable, accepted one of these pensions, he doubtless hoped that the Herdsman might prove the surest available protector of his country. This he must often have found a forlorn hope. The Herdsman had many herds, and was quite as likely to be at play with the Lion, the Leopard, of with both, as opposing either of them, and to oppose both of them at once was never politic. However, so long as the pope, this Herdsman, might be looked upon as an agency at least semidivine, one might look upon disappointments to which his seeming negligence contributed as but part of that puzzling human destiny which God, even in his mercy, never renders quite smooth, peaceful, or simple. To doubt as to the divine viceregal commission of the papacy, however, naturally might turn the troubled Swiss to God more directly, in their fight to maintain independence with avaricious neighbors every side. In this sense Zwingli's "Fable of the Ox" becomes a sort of prelude to a type of reformation which might serve anywhere, given but a situation in which this reformation had no already existent institution or potency to set between a body of citizenry and the divine source of public morality and social order. In Germany the princes were to bulwark the Reformation, in England a monarch was to forge it, in France some powerful nobles were to use and then reject it. In Switzerland was to be inaugurated still another type of Reformation for *independents,* who might, with the direct assistance of God, set about the task of erecting the social-political pattern which his *law* was believed to ordain.

---

[1] *The Fable of the Ox . . . by Huldreich Zwingli of the Toggenburg, in crude centimetre form* (1510).

Six years after having written the above-quoted fable, its author, Huldreich Zwingli, retired to a famous monastery among the mountains of his Switzerland. Here, during a period of three years, "he attained a perfect knowledge of both Testaments" of the Bible.[2] In the course of this study his confidence in the Herdsman greatly deteriorated. Everywhere, in those days, there seemed to lurk danger in too close study of the Bible.

We need not dwell upon the experience of Zwingli, about whose personality gathered the forces of the Reformation in Switzerland and some adjacent portions of Germany. He was a closer, cooler reasoner than Luther. For controversy based upon Scripture he prepared himself most thoroughly, committing to memory practically the entire New Testament in Greek. In 1519 he went to Zürich, "to take charge of the people at Zürich in the matter of preaching the word of the Lord." The name and works of Luther were beginning to be known. While announcing to his congregation that he himself refrained from reading Luther's works, he commended them to his congregation's attention.[3] One suspects a note of personal vanity. At all events Zwingli and Luther were soon to definitely part their ways, on matters of theology, and also in their manner of conceiving the function of civil organization in the Christian world. While Luther continued faithful to his idea that Church and State were separate organs of Christian society, Zwingli believed in no essential separation between Church and civil governing authority. While, in practice, the balance of power under Lutheranism drifted decidedly to the side of the political princes, Zwingli, before Calvin and Knox, in large measure ruled a civil community in the rôle of *preacher.* Also, even more broadly than Calvin after him, he spread and scattered his political activity, and in Switzerland the Reformation became clearly a battle for independence, on the part of Swiss cities and cantons. With him also ranged certain cities of the south of Germany, where the government of princes was not altogether welcome.

---

[2] From the life of Zwingli by Oswald Myconius (1532), his first biographer.

Zwingli died, comparatively young, and before Calvin had turned reformer. So it fell to his more cool, and perhaps abler successor, to carry on the work of showing how "the principles of Christ contribute greatly to the peace of the State." It took much time to discover and adjust the precise sort of "purity" of Christian doctrine upon which the peace and prosperity of nations might securely rest. The immediate result of Calvinism, as well as Lutheranism, was war. As war let us trace Calvinism from Calvin's country, France.

Zeal for the study of the Bible came to France early in the sixteenth century. Beginning his history with the year 1517, Theodore de Bèze writes:[4]

> James Faber of Staples in Picardy (Le Fevre d'Étaples), Doctor of the Sorbonne, but worthy of better company, seeing the University of Paris

---

[3] So Myconius reports of him, in his *Biography.*

[4] Quoting from the 1580 edition, *Histoire Ecclésiastique des Églises Réformées,* book i.

> completely pickled in a brine of horrible barbarism and sophistry,[5] regimented anew and properly the study of the arts, laboring likewise to point out and correct faults in the current translation (of the New Testament).

The Sorbonne was to prove the first determined enemy of early attempts to reform scholastic theology, and even forbid the study of the Greek and Hebrew texts of the Bible. Toward the end of 1520 Lutheran heresy entered France with sufficient prominence to be noted:

> At this time there sprang up a heresy, originated by a monk of the name Martin Luther. . . . How many evils may not be brought to pass by idleness and curiosity, when coupled with vanity! [6]

So a good secretary of a king's minister sets down in his journal at the end of that year. Before the next year ended the works both of Faber and of Luther had been condemned by the Sorbonne. The French king, Francis I, was not yet a declared enemy of the new ideas, which his sister openly favored, and several years later, when the Sorbonne had banned the study of Greek and Hebrew, he endowed for one of his protégés a school for the study of these languages.[7]

The new theology got its first foothold in the diocese of Meaux, where, not long after Luther's condemnation, the bishop preached reform doctrine. The movement here was soon scattered, some of the leaders preceding Calvin to Geneva, Faber himself refuging with the Protestant king of Navarre.

---

[5] Rabelais has his own way of satirizing at once this barbarism and sophistry. We shall not attempt to translate it, since withdrawn from its context and intention, its humor evaporated, little might be preserved save a salaciousness easily found wrapped in cheaper packages. Pantagruel meets a student of the university and asks him how he passes the time.—"Nous transfretons la Sequane au dilecule et crepiscule; nous diambulons par les compites et quadrives de l'urbe; nous despumons la verbocination latiale, et, comme verisimiles amorabonds, captons la benevolence de l'omnijuge, omniforme, et omnigene sexe féminin. Certaines diecules, nous invisons les lupanares de Champgaillard, de Matcon, de Cul de sac, de Bourbon, de Glattigny, de Huslieu, et, en extase venereique, inculcons nos veretres es penitissimes recesses des pudentes de ces meretricules amicabilissimes; puis cauponizons es tabernes meritoires de la Pommes de pin, du Castel, de la Magdaleine, et de la Mulle, belles spatules vervecines, perforammées de pétrosil. Et si, par forte fortune, y à rarité ou penurie de pécune en nos marsupies, et soient exhaustes de metal ferrugine, pour l'escot nous dimittons nos codices et vestes oppignerées, prestolans les tabellaires a venir des penates et lares patriotiques." Pantagruel, book ii, chap. vi.

[6] *Journal de Jean Barrillon, Secrétaire du Chancelier Duprat,* II, 179. The same year another chronicler in France also noted the appearance of the Lutheran heresy. Batiffol, *Le Siècle de la Renaissance,* 156.

[7] This foundation later became, and is The Collège de France.

We may, however, leave these preliminary attempts to bring about constructive reforms, based largely upon the reading of the Bible. All the force which they were ultimately to have concentrated in the end about the old antipapal Gallicanism of the Church in France. It was on the basis of revolutionary doctrine, accepted in the face of the fact that it meant schism with the traditional Church, that the reform in France became militant, and militant reform in France meant Calvinism. It is then to him that we must turn.

John Calvin, though known more generally as leading from Switzerland the forces of reform marshaled by his theological formulas, was French; born in Picardy, at Noyon. Picardy is a rich agricultural country, low hillocks with gentle slopes, which the grain fields mount and descend without interruption. Its capital, Amiens, seems still to bespeak certain Norman characteristics: a cold practicality; forbidding house façades with close-barred shutters frowning upon clean bare streets. Among the French the Normans pass as canny in their financial preoccupations, and rather given to avarice.

Calvin's father seems to have been a good Norman as far as business was concerned. Descended from a humble family of boatmen upon the Oise, he married well—the attractive daughter of a well-to-do innkeeper. He became an ecclesiastical man of affairs of rather impressive title: *Notaire Apostolique, Procureur fiscal du Comte, Scribe en Cour d'Église, Secrétaire de l'Évêche, et Promoteur du Chapitre.* He died excommunicate, but this appears to have been for no religious reason, but because, for some five years preceding his demise, he had rendered no account of his financial stewardship.

Calvin's mother, of whom he appears to have had affectionate memories, died while he was a child; his father married again, and *Jean* was placed as a boarding guest in the family of a small noble. Meanwhile his father had procured for him, at the age of twelve, an ecclesiastical benefice, to which a second was later added. So his education was provided for, and he soon showed himself a diligent and capable student. At first intended for a career in the Church, at twenty his father decided to make a lawyer of him, and he went to Orléans to study law. Here he worked hard, attracting the attention of his law professors. In addition he acquired a considerable knowledge of the classics and dyspepsia. From Orléans he went to the University of Bourges, apparently because the latter city was a quieter place in which to concentrate upon his work. Here he began to learn Greek, and also gained some knowledge of the doctrines of Luther. While he was in Bourges his father died, Calvin probably not having seen him for several years previously. Following his father's death he went to Paris, still an enthusiastic student, who soon published an edition of Seneca's essay "On Kindness" with Latin commentary.

The public acts of the Sorbonne authorities had not banished Lutheran ideas from university circles, and somewhere during 1532-1533 Calvin became deeply interested in the New Testament of Erasmus; and read with interest also some sermons of Luther. In 1533 his name was linked with that of the rector of the university, in a public expression of reformed doctrine, inspired rather by Erasmus than Luther, although referring to "Christian philosophy" as a revelation of the fact that sins were forgiven by the pure grace of God. The rector was accused of teaching Lutheran heresy, and obliged to flee to Basle in Switzerland. Calvin, who was later believed to have written the rector's address,[8] also withdrew from Paris, and a year later returned to Noyon, his birthplace, resigned his two ecclesiastical livings, and was apparently for a time imprisoned there. The arrest was doubtless for suspected heresy, and his release almost immediately evidence that he could not be convicted of it. In these days it was almost a regular part of heresy or witchcraft trials to charge some monstrous crime, even on the slenderest of evidence, as a means of awakening public prejudice against the accused. Calvin was, it seems, also accused of sodomy, and Catholic hatred of him later evolved the legend that he had at this time been burned upon the shoulder with the mark of a lily (*fleur-de-lys*) as a sodomite.[9] He was now at all events, by reason of his connection with the trouble in Paris, a marked man, and for a time he passed from place to place in France, making acquaintances among several reformers of various opinions. At the end of 1534, already known as among the prominent persons in the reform movement, he too took refuge in Basle, where already there was a group of French refugees.

---

[8] Choisy, *Calvin Educateur des Consciences,* 25 note, judges it hardly probable that Calvin had an actual hand in writing the address which caused the Rector Cop to flee to Switzerland.

Here, during the years 1535 and 1536 he sat down to study Hebrew, and to write, at the age of twenty-six, and in a remarkably short space of time, what was to become in various accumulating versions, a very long, very orderly, eloquent, and facile system of Biblical theology. It was published first in Latin, under the title *The Institute of the Christian Religion.* The form was in a sense derived from the medieval *summa* of theology, Luther in a measure influenced the order of the first edition, Augustine in part its doctrine. It was the eloquence, the enclyclopædic comprehensiveness of plan and its orderly development, its emphasis upon the authority of moral law, and its contrast between the holiness of God and the sinfulness of man, that Calvin particularly contributed. It was to become not only the authoritative outline of Calvinist theology, but in the broad and long, the pattern of Protestant Biblical theology for a long period.

There is a tendency to look for and find morose severity, harsh intolerance, evidenced even in the early life of Calvin, and considerable evidence that he did not so impress his friends during this period. Before he became a religious zealot he was a cultivated scholar, of learning, ability, and critical insight, with a passion for knowledge, and a passion for morals. "He was above all extremely conscientious, religious in an admirable manner, a severe censor of all the vices of his companions."[10] That he was either sour or morose one is disposed to doubt. But the central point of his conversion experience was quite other than that of Luther. The *saving grace* which Luther found liberated, energized, gave confidence for action. Its abuse fell to the side of fleshliness. He was later, like Paul before him, to be accused of condoning, if not encouraging libertinage. Calvin found an all-powerful God, who had given men a moral law which none of them could fulfill completely, but who was also, in his transcendent wisdom, disposed to forgive some chosen few their shortcomings and their lapses. Indeed Calvin's personality touched that of Luther hardly anywhere. It links, in different senses, both with those of Pascal and Immanuel Kant, both of whom far surpassed him in imaginative grasp and in profundity. A character of dignity such as Calvin's, a mind of the comprehensive grasp of his, without imagination, could hardly be profound; without imagination it was cold, and its limitations became hard and fixed. Seizing upon Luther's doctrine of *grace* he gave it an emphasis that appealed to the unimaginative and prosaic. His pedestrianism was not that of Luther, homely and hearty, expressive of the flush, the vulgarity, the splash and the sprawl of the rising middle class, the sweat and the litter, as well as the warmth of household hearths. It was rather expressive, in religious guise, of the single-minded amputation of all foolishness and wasted gestures which impeded the successful arrival at a narrowly conceived end. So might the middle class upon the rise gain heaven somewhat as they might hope to make their way in the world, husbanding pennies against the momentary temptation of a stick of candy, to breed the dollars which would earn eternal interest later on.

---

[9] See a vituperous *Histoire de la Vie . . . de Jean Calvin* of one Bolsec, published at Lyons in 1571. Here it is stated that he "fût surprins ou convaincu du péché de Sodomie, pour lequel il fût en danger de mort par feu. . . . Mais que l'Évesque de ladite ville par compassion fait modérer ladite peine en une marque de fleur-de-lys chaude sur l'épaule."

We must not expect Calvin to exhibit the pettiness his system might so easily breed, but neither must we, in turning to glance at his *Institute of the Christian Religion,* forget that it was his Protestant formula which was most coherently and successfully to win battles, wherever the fortunes of kings and liberated Christians parted company. Luther swept away an old organized religious force. He left men with seeds of salvation in their hearts, and no simple easy formula as to how to use it. Calvin organized a new religious force. Luther, in a sense, took the old ideal of *noblesse oblige,* not as a class sign but as a Christian mark and duty; aimed to make Christian noblemen of peasants even. Calvin took Christianity in a sympathetic form to the new nobility, that understood how *law* might clearly point them what was, and what was not safe to do, if they wished to attain the thing they were after. So may we turn to Calvin's *Institute,* not only for the insight we may gain from it as to Calvin's personality, but also, more broadly, that it may cast light upon the subsequent fortunes of Protestantism in European history.

---

[10] So writes Theodore de Bèze of the young Calvin.

Calvin's *Institute* is a long treatise, easily filling three or four volumes of argument, which flows with clear logical reasoning, from a first chapter "Upon the Knowledge of God, Considered as the Creator and Sovereign Monarch of the World," to a final chapter "Upon Political Administration and Civil Government." The very titles of these two chapters are significant as to what lies between them.

Underneath the whole work, as basis for its subject matter in frequent quotation, woven through as a theme, to show the place of the Scriptures in the scheme of salvation, is the Bible. But, in contrast to many other Christian doctors, beginning conspicuously with Paul, Calvin is interested to point out, not any breach between the standpoints of the Old and the New Testaments, but rather the underlying harmony which links the two, as part of one great revealed law, for the government of mankind.

> I admit very willingly the differences (between Old and New Testaments) which are indeed mentioned in Scripture itself, but on condition that in nothing do they detract from the unity . . . [Which unity is of such nature that] nothing hinders the promises of the Old and the New Testaments to remain always the same, and that Jesus Christ remains the single foundation, both of the one and of the other.[11]

The Gospel merely reveals more clearly and directly the gracious promise of the Old Testament; it gives life and solidity to what is merely prefigured in a shadowy way in the Old Testament. Though the *old law* was written on tables of stone, the *new law* in the hearts of men, this does not imply any failure of the promises of the old law. Even Paul does not imply this. So too, he says, Paul's contrast between the two laws, as one of servitude the other of freedom, is of no grave importance, but applies to the *ceremonial of the Temple.* The final difference between the two Testaments, and the crowning glory of the New, is the fact that in it the promise of salvation is laid open to Gentiles as well as Jews.

---

[11] Book ii, chap. xi. This passage is followed by an analysis of these differences under five heads, summarized in the sentences following.

Calvin is a glib and facile reasoner, disposing easily of passages conflicting with one another or his own ideas. Here he shows some lameness, in arguing away a contrast at the very basis of Paul's experience and thought. This, however, had to be done, because the ethical rational of the Old Testament rested upon obedience to a written law, and for Calvin "the true worship of God consists in obedience."[12] Faith even, he says, *is called obedience,* "which faith God prefers to any other service whatsoever."[13] The *universal curse* fallen upon mankind by reason of Adam's *rebellion,* shows "how disagreeable to God is the transgression of the Law."[14]

So the *righteousness,* springing out of faith, imputed to man on the grounds of his impulses toward God in faith, which had liberated and energized both Paul and Luther, becomes for Calvin a *justification,* a declaration of innocence before the tribunal of God: "A man is said to be justified before God when he is dismissed as righteous before his tribunal."[15]

This imputation of righteousness is by no means made by slurring the enormity of man's sinning. Save for the *grace* flowing from the spirit of Christ, the terrible rigor of the law would "adjudge mankind entire to the wrath and malediction of God."[16] "All the faculties, all the potencies of man, from his intelligence to his will, from his soul even to his body, are soiled and filled full of this sinful desire, so that man, to put it briefly, is no other thing than just concupiscence."[17] The tyranny of sin, arising from the rebellion of Adam, "has not only spread out over all men, but more than that, it has laid hold upon their souls entirely."[18] So, the two sorts of knowledge most essential to man (to know God and to know himself) lead to the contrast between the goodness and justice of God and the vileness of man; and man's knowledge of himself is again a contrast, of what he might have been, had Adam rested in obedience, with what total depravity has resulted from this primal fall.[19]

---

[12] *Institute,* II, viii.

[13] *Ibid.,* III, ii.

[14] *Ibid.,* III, iv.

[15] *Ibid.,* III, xi.

[16] *Commentary on the Psalms* (Psalm xix, 8).

Despite Calvin's preoccupation with the depravity of mankind, it is a mistake to number him among the sadists his doctrine helped to develop as the puritan spirit evolved. He dwells with no unction either upon instincts he reproved, or upon the terrors involved in their punishment. It was left to later preachers to expatiate warmly upon the pains of hell and damnation. Calvin rather lops coldly off the unregenerate, showing about as much interest in them as the hardened criminal judge, when once he has his criminal in jail. There were two horns to the Doctrine of Election Calvin was to expound. One was sadist, the other was smug, and of the two Calvin leaned rather to the smug side than the sadist, despite what vehemence he might use in declaring himself a sinner.

The most hopeful element in Calvin's whole system of theology was his *Doctrine of Election.* Indeed, since any but the Elect according to this doctrine would have been but wasting their time to read Calvin's treatise, even the distressing picture of man's sinful nature it painted need hardly disturb the reader.

This doctrine was based upon a fact clearly perceived by two New Testament writers, Paul and the author of the Fourth Gospel; and even more emphatically by Augustine and Martin Luther. The fact perceived was that not all men, apparently, recognized the truth in Christ. It was not only that Christians had a way of failing to follow consistently a gospel they accepted, but many appeared in no way touched or moved to recognize or accept it. All of the above-named writers recognized a line of human division between those who were, and those who were not, moved to accept and follow the Gospel. Paul, before everything a missionary, out to *win souls,* speaks almost always of and to those who are moved to accept Christ. Augustine rests his division line between the *two cities* upon these two classes. But Luther, the ideal of Christendom in his background, in a general way assumes that citizen and Christian are roughly synonymous.

---

[17] *Institute,* II, i.

[18] *Ibid.,* II, ii.

[19] *Ibid.,* book i, chap. ii particularly.

None the less there was a clear tradition of this line of division separating mankind, and of course classes of such importance have to be distinguished by names. Paul had chosen, as a name for that class who possessed the disposition of faith in Christ, what was for a Jew the most natural of terms. He called them the *chosen out,* the elect. For Jewish thought the children of Israel had long been a people chosen out by Jehovah, from among the nations of the world. Even Jewish thought had at times gone still farther, in an attempt to find, among this chosen people, a chosen group. In short, when it became necessary for him to find a name for those touched by Christian faith, it would have been difficult for Paul to have missed the choice of the term he used. He merely changed the basis of distinction, from birth according to the flesh, and circumcision, to birth according to the spirit, with faith and baptism.

So far as we know, Paul never met circumstances leading him to discuss the how and why of this choosing out of certain persons for the life of faith. He had been merely convinced, by his own experience, that certain persons were "laid hold on" by Christ, in a process which they might not ascribe to any virtue in themselves. The saving message was for all men. Those *foreseen* (perhaps as susceptible merely; Paul never enters into the premises of such foreknowledge) are *called* to preparation for their inheritance. They are then *sanctified*—that is, undergo the preparation. Finally they are *glorified,* receive the promised inheritance.[20] Of this process Paul considers it his business to concentrate upon sanctification; and, despite the bulk and import of his theological suggestion, Paul left the matter of *calling* Christians where the authors of the Gospels (of the Fourth most clearly and consciously) had left it, with Jesus.

So Paul has no doctrine of election; he has merely a name, *elect,* as an alternative for Christian. Later, however, when Augustine was called upon to controvert Pelagius, he found it necessary to show something of why people did not, and could not, go about of their own efforts saving themselves, but why some were chosen out, inspired by God, to choose citizenship in the Eternal City.

So might Calvin find, in Augustine, the germ of a doctrine of election. It is hardly claimed that he did much with it constructively. He was by no means a speculative theologian. There is one thing, however, which he did do with it, and which others after him were even more unctious about doing—he emphasized it. As already said, his emphasis upon the doctrine was on the smug side. He dismissed, as among the inscrutable counsels of God, the reason why some men had been foreordained, ere they were born, to suffer eternal torment as sinners. What occupied him was the assurance of safe and orderly conditions among which the *elect* might work out their salvation with as much or little fear and trembling as their particular natures dictated.

Such an interest was not slow of appreciation among the elect. In fact, in comparison with the task of providing for them, the whole problem of why God had chosen some and rejected others might well be left among God's incomprehensible secrets. All that Calvin felt called upon to do was to assure the elect that there is no injustice in the fact of God's having chosen them, while others had been rejected.

Another important matter was hidden in God's secret councils.

---

[20] Romans VIII. 30. "Whom he (God) foresaw, such he also called; and whom he called, these likewise he *made* (or *declared*) *righteous;* and those made (or declared) righteous, he glorified." Huge piles of controversy have accumulated about a word, the two possible significances of which divide Paul's Jewish and Christian life. His meaning is none the less hardly a matter of doubt. He teaches of Christian life repeatedly as a process of sanctification.

It was plain to Calvin, having himself known vicissitudes, that the elect were not freed by God, from pain, trouble, sorrow, or even temptation to sin. But such discomfitures, falling upon the elect, are no sign of God's rejection of them. They are so preserved that, despite everything, they cannot irrevocably fall away. They must not, therefore, despair, once having been *called,* since they cannot hopelessly sin. The Devil, who has the reprobate in any case, naturally employs his subtlest temptations against the elect, dangling before them doubt as to their election, or inspiring in them curious desires to question of matters which must rest among the "impenetrable secrets of God's wisdom." [21]

The beginning and the end of certainty as to election lies in the fact that one has been *called* (converted). The sole legitimate source of confirmation from time to time as to the certainty of this calling, is to consider the benefits which daily spring from our divine adoption.[22] The test is rendered certain. If our efforts and purposes succeed it is evidence that God is favoring them; if we seem frustrated and surrounded with difficulties God is trying and strengthening us as among his rarer spirits. The pleasanter evidence was naturally that of success. It became very difficult to convince a Calvinist that, so long as his efforts succeeded, he need doubt that God was partner in his affairs.

Lutheran bars had been set entirely too low. Almost anyone might be saved if, for example, in a burst of expansiveness, the voice or personality of Jesus touched some resonant chord in his sinful nature. Calvin did not intend to see heaven such a messy place. Had not Luther himself said that lawyers were robbers? Stuff and nonsense! What heaven needed was a good legal mind at the gate to countersign the passports.

Calvin by no means confined his systematized theology to questions of hell and damnation, election and its joys and perils. The whole foundation and claims of the traditional Church had to be discussed, in well-arranged order, and finally the question of political authority. Luther, in attacking this problem, had as always thrown his heart into the solution. He had appealed to the princes of the German nation to take upon themselves the task of governing society as members of the community of Christians called and appointed to the maintenance of justice and order.[23] The last sentence of his letter addressed "To the Christian Nobles of the German Nation" summarizes its spirit: *"Gott gebe uns allen einen christlichen Verstand, und besonders dem christlichen Adel deutscher Nation einen rechten, geistlichen Mut, an der armen Kirche das Beste zu tun."* [24]

---

[21] *Institute,* III, xxiv.

[22] Same chapter, in later paragraphs.

Calvin, proceeding in his orderly manner, comes finally to treat of civil authority. He divides his treatment characteristically. His subject consists of three parts: the first, treating of magistrates, who are custodians and conservators of the law; second, of the laws themselves which these magistrates are to enforce; third, of the people who are to be governed by these laws and to obey these magistrates.[25] But it is hardly worth our while here to consider Calvin's theories with respect to law in the Christian community. An unusual set of circumstances put largely into his hands the task of instituting, upon a small scale, a community of the elect in the city of Geneva.

The city of Geneva had come to be governed, rather badly, by a combination of three authorities, a bishop, a prince, and a democratic council composed of the heads of all the families of its citizenry. In feudal law the authority of the bishop was theoretically supreme among these three organs. He was not only the ecclesiastical head, but was also the feudal lord. He was general of the armed forces of the city, supreme judge both in civil and ecclesiastical cases, the city coinage was minted in his name.

Revolution commenced in Geneva unconnected with the Reformation, in a struggle between the people and their bishop, leagued with the prince of some measured political jurisdiction. The league between bishop and prince was rather close, since the prince was the Duke of Savoy, and the particular bishop against whom the revolution came was distinguished from other bishops of Geneva by being known as the Bastard of Savoy.

---

[23] "Geistliche und Weltliche im Grunde in Wahrheit nicht untersieden sind als in bezug auf das Amt und Werk, und nicht in bezug auf den Stand" (early paragraph in same work).

[24] "God give to us all the understanding of Christians, and particularly to the Christian nobles of the German nation an upright, spiritual courage to do their best for the poor Church."

[25] *Institute,* book iv, 20.

When appeals of the people to Rome against their bishop led to no redress, the Genevans decided to settle their own political difficulties, leaguing with other cities of Switzerland which had already adopted the reformed religion. About the time that Calvin finished writing his *Institute,* the citizens joined together in an oath "to live according to the Reformation of the Holy Gospel" (*Selon la Reformation du S. Evangile*). Calvin was called as professor of the Scriptures (*Sacrarum litterarum in Ecclesiam Genevensi professor*), which, according to his own theories of civil government, made him the principal author and inspirer of a code of ordinances soon formulated.

Citizenship and membership in the local religious community was now made more definitely one and the same thing even than medieval assumption made it. All citizens were obliged by law to attend Sunday service at church, and to participate four times a year in the service of communion. In this way excommunication became a serious civil, as well as religious, penalty; and it was made the punishment of irregularities of many sorts. Drastic reforms were attempted. "A card player was pilloried; a tire-woman, a mother, and two bridesmaids were arrested because they adorned the bride too gayly; an adulterer was driven with the partner of his guilt through the streets by the public hangman, and then banished." [26] With neither hesitation nor scruple the magistrates, searching the Scriptures, and seeking the enlightenment of God in reason and conscience, intervened in the private life of citizens. They might even refuse to allow a citizen to change from one trade to another.[27]

People in Geneva had hardly dreamed that their oath to live according to the reformed gospel was to be taken so seriously. In less than two years Calvin was driven out by a storm of public disapproval. A remnant remained faithful, with whom Calvin continued correspondence from Strassburg. This misfortune, he writes them, had come because of the contempt, or at least nonchalance, with which they had treated the word of God, and their lack of strict obedience.[28] In the end the perseverance of the elect conquered, and Calvin was back after some years, to end his days in Geneva, virtual ruler of a civil community in which the elect had inherited at least this small portion of the earth. More than this, a pattern was established to be useful elsewhere later. This civil pattern, in which the theologian was the mentor of the magistrate, the preacher instigator of the police, and in which the laity were made participants in ecclesiastical government, insisted upon no particular *form* of government, provided only that the sovereignty of God, as entrusted to the elect, was uncontroverted. All that was necessary was an unquestioned law, which the reason and conscience of the elect approved. As the law of Scripture developed inconveniences, other authoritative legal codes, so long as they assured the salvation of the elect, might be substituted. For theocracy was soon to prove but the transient form of this new type of civil government. The old social system had been based upon personal prerogative. The boundaries of the permissible were in this way left uncertain. But law was not only a far more definite measure of what could or could not be done; it was also more easily to be altered according to circumstances than age-honored customs and prerogatives. Luther's vision had freed the spirit for new flights of aspiration. Calvinism was to lay down a new pattern for the world Luther had freed, which tacitly declared *freedom* to be all well enough, if only it be regimented so to act as never to disconcert the god-approved ends and purposes of the elect.

---

[26] *Cambridge Modern History,* II, 368.

[27] Choisy, *Calvin Educateur des Consciences,* 68-71.

---

[28] Letter of Calvin, "A mes bien aymés frères en notre Seigneur qui sont les reliques de la dissipation de l'Église de Genève," Oct. 20, 1538.

## XLVI

THE movement of religious reform in the sixteenth century came first to France as a liberator, and along with new zeal for learning and culture. In this guise it touched at the beginning a small portion of the feudal nobility of France, which class was considered by the cultured Italians, at the beginning of this century, to be ignorant and scornful of all accomplishments save of war and arms.

> The French know only the nobility of arms, not valuing at all any other; to such extent that, not only do they not appreciate the art of letters, but they abhore it, counting the literati the vilest of all men.[1]

But these nobles, reacting against the bourgeois aims and preoccupations of Louis XI, had undertaken, immediately after his death, ambitious military plans of conquest in Italy, from which they brought home no solid military victory, but from which they did bring home the Renaissance. And when Lutheran ideas touched free-thinking intellectuals and artists of the two courts of Francis I and his sister, Margaret of Navarre, they seemed at first a part of this Renaissance, come to banish the gloominess, and the sense of being priest-ridden, which had settled upon the latest period of the Middle Ages, and to embrace human salvation in the new liberation of the human spirit.

So the new ideas seem to have touched the poet Clement Marot, the first conspicuous French man of letters to be identified with the reformed religion, and so much a favorite at both of these courts that his sympathies for reformed religion and his personal popularity were for a time alternately getting him into and out of trouble. Marot certainly embraced no gloomy puritanism. In a satire written as a result of his first imprisonment, in the cause of religion, he likens his sentence to an experience in hell, where he introduces himself to the infernal judge as one *known to Pan,* and to the fauns who dance before the satyrs following.[2]

---

[1] Castiglione, *Il Cortegiano* (1524), book i, 42.

We have also noted how the Lutheran ideas, following upon humanistic interest in the study of the Greek Bible, caused trouble in the University of Paris. Here the intellectual authority of the old order was menaced, and here too the new religious ideas might be seized upon by the freer intellectual spirits, whose revolt had already been voiced by Rabelais, with his biting satire and in his imagined *Abbey of Heart's Desire* (*L'Abbaye de Thelême*), and was soon to be expressed by Montaigne, in a disconcerting mistrust of reasoning.

Luther's heresy soon appeared to be above everything an attack upon religious institutions, the pope particularly, and next monastic properties. Here the French monarch had no use for it, since he had already arranged things comfortably between himself and the pope (Leo X), in a *concordat* which transferred to him some ecclesiastical revenues, and in general all the ecclesiastical patronage of his realm, settling the financial difficulties between king and pope which had been prominent for more than a century.

Also it may be said of the French in general that they had learned to live with the Roman Catholicism which was to follow the Council of Trent, before it had come to exist. The Middle Ages had developed an inner freedom obliged to find its place underneath a very complicated system of conventions. Nowhere had these conventions so developed in complication, in clarity, in subtle refinement, as in France; while, on the other hand, nowhere in Europe of the Middle Ages had the human spirit been so quick to adapt, so habile in finding freedom, appropriating for its institutions such stability as traditional religion might offer, while discovering and using such opportunities of free action as it left, or might be developed out of it.

[2] En la mer suis cogneu des plus haults Dieux—
En terre aussi des Faunes et Hymnides
Cogneu je suis . . .,
Du gentil Pan qui les flutes manie
D'Ègle, qui danse au son de l'harmonie,
Quand elle veoit les satyrs suyvans.
*L'Enfer.*

The French were less cynical than the Italians in viewing ecclesiastical abuses, also less impressed by pomp; nor had they Italy's material stake in the continuance of papal power. On the other hand they were conservative in religious matters, and while quick to fight for national rights against the popes, they had also proven many times, and were still to prove, dependable bulwarks of popes in their times of weakness.

Also, when the Protestant spirit later more definitely entered France, in its Calvinist form, it was to develop a temper unsympathetic to the mass of the French. This antagonism may be exemplified in the poetic retort of the poet Ronsard, to an attack upon his *morals* by the Calvinist leader, Théodore de Bèze. "You complain," he writes, "that my life is lascivious, given to licentiousness, gaming, and vice. 'Tis a rascally lie, and had you followed my way of living for two months, you might have learned its manner."

> M'eveillant au matin, devant que faire rien,
> J'invoque l'Éternal, le père de tout bien,
> Le priant humblement de me donner la grace,
> Et que le jour naissant sans l'offenser se passe;
> Qu'il chasse toute secte et toute erreur de moi,
> Qu'il me veuille garder dans ma première foi,
> Sans entreprendre rien qui blesse ma province,
> Très humble observateur des lois et de mon prince.[3]

He continues to tell how, once risen from his bed and dressed, he gives himself to study and writing, "following his destiny" as devoted from infancy to the Muses. After four or five hours of this he hears mass, returns for an hour of pleasure, dines soberly thanking God for his dinner. After dinner, in fine weather, he goes for a walk, loving woods, wild gardens, streams which murmur at their banks. Other days he seeks his pleasure indoors:

---

[3] Freely translated: "Waking in the morning, the first thing I do is to pray God for grace to pass the day without offense; that all schism and heresy be driven from me, that I may preserve intact my first faith, undertake nothing to the harm of my country, and remain an obedient servant of its laws and of my prince. *Discours des Misères de ce Temps.*

Je dis le mot pour rire, et à la verité.
Je ne loge chez moi trop de severite.
J'aime à faire l'amour, j'aime à parler aux femmes,
À metter par ecrit mes amoureuses flammes;
J'aime le bal, la danse, et les masques aussi,
La musique et le luth, enemies du souci.[4]

Night come, *sans souci* he goes to bed, praying God to pardon his faults with leniency.

Au reste je ne suis ni mutin ni méchant,
Qui fais croire ma loi par le glaive tranchant.
Voila comme je vis; si ta vie est meilleure
Je n'en suis envieux, et sois à la bonne heure.

So I live, neither stubborn nor malevolent, ready to defend my law with my sword. If your life be better, I'm not envious; may it be a happy one.

Such is one characteristic aspect of the total and final reaction of the French spirit to religious reform. Deeper, more solid and comprehensive, are the reflections of another French man of letters, late in the sixteenth century.

> I don't know how it comes about that, in breathing the air of a particular land we by the same means transform the effects of our religion, harmonizing it with the customs of the country whence we are nourished.[5]

To this he adds a second observation, as to the value of old laws, which become customs, and suddenly are found to be deeply lodged natural habits. As such they have become "more easy to digest" than even better ordinances that have not yet paid the "infinite price" which measures the slow process of such natural acceptation. He then applies this principle to religion:

> If this proposition be true as to the common law, it is even more a requisite in what has to do with "venerable" religion, which should, in the judgment of the wise, be sustained by long and old tradition (*par*

---

[4] "I crack jokes, and to be sure don't give much hospitality to severity. I like to make love, chatter with women, write love verses. I love balls, dancing, masquerades, and music, that enemy of care."

[5] Étienne Pasquier, *Les Récherches de la France,* LIII, iv.

*une longue ancienneté*), than by any number of passing and fashionable human reasonings (*par toutes les raisons mondaines des hommes*).[6]

So much for the temperamental background of a period of religious struggle which began with Francis I, some sort of a Catholic, and ended with Henry IV, some sort of a Protestant. But there were more immediate elements of complication fighting in France both for and against the Reformation.

While the *concordat* arranged between Francis I and Leo X was a matter of some considerable satisfaction to the French monarch, it brought little advantage to any other important interest in France. It lessened in no appreciable way financial exactions on the score of religion, but merely transferred from pope to king. The *parlements* were coming to exercise larger influence; the *Third Estate,* or bourgeiosie element in the *parlements,* particularly, because of their measure of control of the purse strings of the realm, in an age when wars were beginning to be fought by paid *soldiers,*[7] often mercenaries. This Third Estate had already shown itself ready, in France as elsewhere, to help kings destroy lesser nobles. It was later to be conspicuously ready to help religion destroy the power of kings, and to help reason destroy the prerogatives of religion. Also it was not to be denied that the clear-cut moral boundaries of Calvinism, with its lack of fuss and feathers, its thoroughgoing aim to establish social order upon a simple pattern of religious consistency, won commendation from a class which was beginning, with some reason, to feel that its industry supported a lot of picturesque paraphernalia of no economic value. To this might be added the zeal for reform in religion, and all the accumulated hatred of religious abuses of many sorts.

All this make up a considerable area of foothold for revolutionary religious ideas. Added to this there were the complicated political schemes of Francis I himself, embittered by a personal feud with the emperor, Charles V, who on his part was soon engaged in fighting Protestants.

[6] *Ibid.,* VIII, xii.

[7] The original meaning of *soldier* is the recipient of a wage, from *solda* (*sou*), a piece of money, and then a wage. Medieval battles were not fought by soldiers, and the problem of paying their wages added new difficulties to the art of war.

Francis had both the imagination and the intelligence to perceive the inherent complications, advantageous and otherwise, of these new ideas. He had ambitions which reformers might further, others they might embarrass. He was little troubled by inconsistencies, capable of a considerable degree of instability and *manque de suite,* and so was affected by all the complications, and in no very consistent order. He might show himself friendly to Erasmus, encourage the linguistic studies of Bude which the Sorbonne condemned, invite Philip Melancthon to his court, where courtiers sang with zest the melodious paraphrases of the psalms that Clement Marot had indited, listen to a sister who urged him to be kind to Protestants, assist at their burning in Paris, and make alliances with them on his eastern frontier.

But when Francis I died, in 1547, the government became the task of a very different sort of man. Henry II was a gentleman and noble of an older school. In presence he was every inch a king. He was an accomplished hunter and doughty knight, destined to lose his life in a jousting bout. Intellectual matters interested him not at all, nor ambitious foreign policies. In reaction against the grandiose political schemes of his father, he set about to consolidate his realm. Furthermore he was pious, and not incapable of a small vindictiveness. When, at his coronation, the officiating cardinal, Archbishop of Rheims, enjoined him to govern as "the priest and servant of almighty God," he understood exactly what was meant. As one of his first acts he instituted a court (*la Chambre Ardente*) to deal with heresy, "so long as error continued to exist in the realm."

Through all his reign of more than twelve years repression never ceased, and with equal persistence the movement of reform grew. Just at the end of his reign an assembly of Protestants met in Paris and drew up a confession of faith, with rules of ecclesiastical order and discipline. Most of the prominent members of this assembly had studied in Geneva. But the situation in France was far from being that of Geneva. Calvinism was here organized in a hostile state. At the end of its confession of faith it was declared that obedience and lawful tribute should be paid to existent rulers "even though they should be unbelievers, provided that the sovereign empire of God remain *en son entier,* a phrase leaving certainly much room for interpretation.[8]

Meanwhile other important things were happening in the smaller circle of the court. A family, hardly of the inner aristocratic circle, had rapidly risen to power under Francis I. One of this family had administered the oath to Henry at his coronation. Another was to be his ablest general and most trusted counselor. This family (the *Guise*) was to add another triumph to its long list, by marrying one of its offspring, Mary Stuart, the unfortunate Mary, Queen of Scots, to the French heir apparent, next to rule as Francis II. Mary captivated the French court, and the affections of her father-in-law. The two heads of the House of Guise were able to use any advantage they possessed.

Something else happened. Francis I's sister, the accomplished Margaret of Navarre, had brought forth a daughter, to marry her into the Bourbon family, a branch of the royal house, and first of the nobility in rank. The House of Navarre, on the other hand, had been embroiled with the pope earlier in the century, and Margaret, touched both by the Renaissance and the reform ideas, had given refuge at her court to many Protestant leaders. So this daughter, destined to marry a Bourbon, had been brought up in contact with the ideas and influences of the movement of religious reform. The Bourbons themselves had their grievances, and one of them had borne arms against Francis I. The ascendancy of the brothers Guise was naturally not looked upon with favor by the Bourbons, and somewhere between 1558 and 1560 Calvinist convictions began to sprout in the Bourbon family.

In the middle of 1559 Henry II died of a wound received in a jousting bout, still in the prime of life and health. The new king was in his sixteenth year, on the completion of which he would reign in his own right. His mother, Catherine de Medici, had occupied a difficult position at court during the life of her husband, a foreigner, scion of a house not yet old enough to be solidly aristocratic, and torn between her admiring love of her husband, and his not less constant love for another woman. For the present she remained in the background, while the two *uncles of the King* (the Guises) proceeded to gather the reins of power into their hands.

---

[8] Article XL of this *Confession of Faith.*

The Bourbons, more than ever in the shade, began to meet in council in their various strongholds, while the Guises surrounded themselves and the person of the king with troops loyal to themselves. Revolutionary action was considered. Calvin was consulted, and first advised against the use of force. Certainly, in Calvinist theory, the ruler of a Christian country should be a Calvinist. Also Calvin admitted that, if agreed upon by the unanimous wishes of the princes of the blood, and upheld by the *parlements* (which latter had been recently excited and divided by a high-handed arrest and condemnation of some of its leaders, for speeches made in open session upon the question of religious reform), revolt against the two "uncles of the King" was permissable, under the law of God which should rule in Christian society.

This was quite enough for the purpose, and an active Bourbon began unostentatiously to collect evidence and information, tending to show that François, Duc de Guise, and Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine, his brother, had been guilty of "a number of crimes of *lèse-majesté,* together with infinite pilferings, thefts, and peculations," not only to the disfavor of the royal purse, but to those of many subjects of the realm. But the next thing was to get the culprits for trial. A plot was formed to seize them, a very loosely and carelessly concocted plot it would seem, while they were guests of the king, at the royal castle of Amboise, on the banks of the Loire in Touraine.

The plot was a pathetic failure. Small bands of plotters were attacked and cut to pieces, some leaders swung as corpses from a parapet of the castle overlooking the river, while the court moved on to another near-by castle, lest this gruesomeness cast a shadow over its gay amusements.

The Bourbons were humiliated; one arrested (the Prince de Condé), another sent as servant of the court to report the conspiracy and its punishment to the *Parlement* of Paris (Anne de

Montmorency, Constable of France). "The Princes of the blood . . . " Voltaire writes, "secretly joined themselves to the Protestants, who began to constitute a considerable party in the realm." [9] Jeanne d'Albret, that daughter of Margaret of Navarre who had married a Bourbon, and who was mother of the Henry of Navarre later to be Henry IV of France, herself confirms the importance of these months following the failure of the Conspiracy of Amboise:

> Since the year 1560, everyone well knows that it pleased God by his grace to withdraw me from the idolatry in which I was too deeply plunged, and to receive me into his Church.[10]

But this year did not pass without the arrival of an entirely different situation. Francis II died, and although during his life even the *Parlement* of Paris was almost obsequious to the Guises, the death of Francis opened lips to speak discontent hitherto unspoken, and left the Guises a little frightened at now evident displeasure over their summary justice. In the meantime the head of the Bourbon house had escaped from virtual imprisonment at the court, to put himself at the head of a Protestant army, and it had become known to the husband of Jeanne d'Albret, King of Navarre, that the boy king had planned his assassination.

In short, the situation was ripe for determined civil war, when the death of Francis II brought a new and very important element into the situation. The next heir, Charles IX, was but in his tenth year. His mother might claim the regency. Indeed, she did not await his death to assure herself of the government,[11] nor did she lose any time in making peace with the Bourbons. The Prince of Condé was freed from the sentence resting against him. The King of Navarre, forswearing his Protestant faith, was given the first office in the realm. She required of these Bourbon chiefs that they make peace with the Guises, and set out to rule in the interests of conciliation, with a counselor even more consistently determined upon allowing freedom of worship to Protestants than she (Michel de l'Hôpital).

---

[9] *Histoire du Parlement de Paris* (published anonymously, but of Voltaire's authorship), chap. xxi.

[10] Jeanne d'Albret, *Mémoires et Poésies,* De Ruble, 1893.

[11] Batifol, *La Siècle de la Renaissance,* 194.

Catherine de Medici describes herself at this time as a mother left with three children, a kingdom all divided, no one to whom she might completely entrust her confidence. The divisions in the realm, the question of religion, were not the only difficulties. Just at the beginning of her regency, for the first time in fifty years the *States General* was in session, and aside from the question of religion, that of finance had forced its assembly. The Chancellor was obliged to confess to the assembly a state deficit of four times the annual revenue of the state.[12] Upon this subject only the *estates* were united—they wished to grant as little money as possible. Desire for religious reform was strong in the *third estate,* and divided the *nobles.* The *clerics* were strong in defense of their prerogatives. "No doubt the Church needs reforming, but the King should neither touch the Church, *immaculate Virgin,* nor its doctrines." As for those of Geneva, the spokesman of the clergy found even their name unpleasant to pronounce, French subjects should be forbidden all commerce with them, as of an infected country.[13]

The attitude of this assembly fortified Catherine's policy of conciliation, but neither side was content. Catholics abused with violence the freedom accorded Protestants, while Protestants felt called upon by the law of Scripture to interfere with Catholic habits of worship. The following year a conference was held, attended by the Protestant leaders and by the General of the Jesuit Company, who called the reformers "monkeys and foxes," warned Catherine against them with impassioned eloquence which brought tears to her eyes, and advised the religious malcontents that the proper place to bring matters of dispute concerning religion and the faith was before the Council of Trent, then in session.[14]

Things drifted from bad to worse. The Protestants, released everywhere from imprisonment by Catherine's edict became bolder than ever, in Aquitaine and in the south generally. Some places

[12] Mouton, *La Vie Municipale au XVI$^e$ Siècle,* 38-39.

[13] Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* VI, i, 36-37.

[14] Theodore de Bèze, *Histoire Ecclésiastique.*

the elected body of city magistrates were Protestants, and by their order statues of saints were decapitated, altar ornaments destroyed. Often similar acts waited no authority. The Guise influence at court was now decidedly in the shade. Freely and openly the Prince of Condé called Huguenot ministers to preach at court. In Paris students attacked parading Protestants, and blood was shed.

In face of the way things seemed to be going the Catholic leaders could hardly remain idle. The Duc de Guise entered into a secret pact with two powerful nobles, which triumvirate won approval, not only from other French nobles of the Catholic party, but from the pope, and from the Catholic rulers of Europe. The King of Spain suggested to Catherine that, if she were unable to put down the heretics, he would lend her an army which would quickly accomplish it. Catherine, however, was far from entertaining the idea of foreigners meddling in the situation. François de Guise, *en route* to Paris with a numerous train, passed by a farm where a Huguenot "preaching" was going on in a barn. His followers undertook to break it up, with the result that more than a score of Protestants were killed, a hundred wounded. But an accidental disorder in itself, it became the signal for open war. Guise, defying the prohibition of the regent, entered Paris, and the populace received him with general acclamation.

The year 1562 was worse than the preceding. After an *edict of pacification* the following year, disbanded soldiers worked almost as much havoc as preceding open war had done. In Paris murders became almost daily occurrences, and went almost always unpunished. In the midst of this disorder Catherine, still doing everything possible to preserve relations with both parties, entered Paris, and became the guest of the Prince of Condé, now the recognized leader of the Protestant, or Huguenot [15] party. This visit terminated, Catherine's hostess also quit Paris, preceding the regent but by a few moments along the road by which Catherine too was to pass. An officer in the train of the Princess de Condé, recognized by the crowd as an active Huguenot, was insulted. A quarrel and bloodshed followed, just at the end of which Catherine herself appeared upon the scene, with her son the king. Catherine was greatly angered at the City of Paris for allowing such disorder, and to pacify her the city fathers granted her one hundred thousand écus, of which she was much in need.

---

[15] The word Huguenots is a corruption of the German word *Eidgenossen,* those bound together by an oath, as the name covenanters later in England.

Indeed the court was always in need of money, and procuring it was never easy. The Duc de Guise had been assassinated, the Prince de Condé made prisoner in open battle, then released in exchange for an important prisoner held by the other side. Coligny, the second in influence among Huguenot leaders had been accused of procuring the assassination of Guise. On all sides the bitterness and hatred grew. At the beginning of 1564 Catherine set off with the king and the court, on a long journey through the realm, which brought her, some eighteen months later, to Bayonne, near the boundary of Spain. There her daughter, the Queen of Spain, came to meet her, and the King of Spain's most important minister. Bitterly this minister (the Duke of Alba) admonished Charles IX that he should banish the heretics from his realm, and accused Catherine of having a Huguenot as her chief adviser (d'Hôpital). From this meeting Catherine doubtless hoped to work toward some diplomatic arrangement with the Catholic powers, but all that it appears to have accomplished was to increase the suspicions of the Protestants, who afterwards believed the massacre of St. Bartholomew's had been then planned. None the less the year 1568 brought a new peace, in March; and a new war, in September. War cost money, and throughout the year 1569 the court was seeking it in every direction.[16]

Again there was peace. The king, now ruling in his own right, but still dominated by his mother, became rather friendly with Coligny, now the head of the Huguenot party, the Prince of Condé having fallen in battle. Peace was however not very profound. The Huguenots were singing:

---

[16] Moulton, *La Vie Municipale au XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle,* 70.

Le Prince de Condé
Il a été tué,
Mais Monsieur l'Amiral
Est encore à cheval,
Avec le Rochefoucauld,
Pour chasser tous les Papaux,
Papaux, Papaux, Papaux![17]

At the beginning of 1571, it being again an important question of money, and also that of the marriage of Catherine's daughter to Henry, King of Navarre, and Protestant, the court moved to Paris, entering with much medieval pomp. While financial discussion was going on with the city chiefs, Henry of Navarre entered with a simpler train. Also a rather absurd quarrel arose, about a monument of revenge erected upon a piece of ground where the house of a condemned Huguenot had been razed. The owner had won pardon and the return of his land, and now demanded that the monument be removed at the city's expense. This controversy occasioned disorder and riot, aggravated by economic distress and rapid rise of prices for food and other necessaries. Then, the marriage festivities hardly finished, Coligny was wounded in an attempted assassination. The king manifested great regret, and it has never been proven that Catherine had any hand in this attempt; but it caused feeling to run higher than ever, and it was not difficult to awaken the king's suspicion against the admiral. In this suspicion, it would appear, the mad stroke was improvised, which was to undo every attempt Catherine had ever made to keep peace. The massacre of the Eve of St. Bartholomew was carried out, the young Duc de Guise himself taking care that this time Coligny did not escape. Zest for murder and pillage spread beyond the original intention, and despite this a party of important leaders escaped. However, in compensation, hundreds of innocents, including women and children, perished. The number of victims is not certainly known, but mounted in Paris toward a claimed total of three thousand. The King of Navarre and the new Prince de Condé were put under virtual arrest, and made a temporary abjuration of their Protestant faith. Then, after a period, Henry escaped from court, flew to his country and to arms, renouncing his return to Catholicism, and war was on again, more bitterly than ever.

---

[17] "The Prince de Condé has been killed, but the Admiral (Coligny) is still a-horseback, with le Rochefoucauld, to get after all the papists.

We need not follow this warfare, under the young King of Navarre, now acknowledged head of the Protestant party. Henry was a gallant captain, a quick-witted tactician, but it was difficult to find any strategic plan behind his battles fought here, there, and everywhere. But the situation was again to change with the death of Charles IX. He, like his brother Francis, had died without an heir. From Poland, where he had but recently been made king, another brother was summoned to rule. The only other remaining son of Catherine was killed in battle. Henry III had peculiar habits which made it unlikely that he should ever become the father of a son, and the Catholics were horror stricken to know that the Protestant Henry of Navarre was now the rightful heir apparent to the throne.

Now began the final, and the most complicated and acrimonious period of the whole bitter and bloody struggle. A Catholic *league,* known as the *Sacred Union,* was formed, "to reëstablish in its entirety the holy worship of God according to the form of the Catholic, apostolic, and Roman Church." This was not all. This league went about to arrange the succession to the throne. Henry III, at first sympathetic to the league, and solemnly placing himself at its head, soon had reason to fear its growth in influence. Although pretending to support the succession of a Catholic Bourbon, barring Henry of Navarre, there was excellent reason to believe that the Guises were, in reality, paving the way for the ascension of the young Duke of Guise to the throne.[18] Meanwhile the Guises showed themselves clearly to dominate the city of Paris, where the Duke entered with an army in defiance of the king's prohibition, and whence, during the course of an uprising, the king was obliged to flee. Then another mad St. Bartholomew's was planned upon a smaller scale. Summoned to the king's castle at Blois, first the Duke de Guise, then his brother, the Cardinal de Guise, were assassinated. Catherine de Medici, who had not been consulted, was terror stricken at the news. It was the end of Henry's power. Henry of Navarre had now been excommunicated, Henry III was, *ipso facto,* for having killed a cardinal. Soon the two Henrys were leagued together, in war with the League; but not for long. Before the year ended Henry III died himself by an assassin's hand, and the Protestant Henry of Navarre was, by right of birth, Henry IV, King of France: "a king without a crown, a general without money, a husband without a wife."

---

[18] The duke had prepared a genealogy of his house, tracing his lineage back to Charlemagne, and was in treaty with the pope, to have old Hugh Capet declared a usurper—attaining some six hundred years of Capetian kings.

The war which followed, in which Henry IV won his kingdom, was hardly longer a struggle between Catholics and Protestants. In so far as it remained a religious war, it was rather between the strengthened ultramontaine Catholicism which had followed the Council of Trent, and the Catholic Gallicanism and Protestantism leagued together. Henry had against him every resource which the papacy could muster in France; he had for him that strongest of all loyalties in the Frenchman's heart—his love of France, and unwillingness to tolerate outside interference. It was plainly France for Frenchmen first, religion afterwards. And yet, for the mass won by Henry's gallantry, the religion which came after patriotism was plainly the old religion, and not the new. Though unwilling to desert those Protestants who had for some time looked upon him as their leader, Henry himself soon perceived this.

There were, and were long to be, zealous Protestants in France, but one may well wonder whether Henry IV was ever at any time of their number. His grandmother, Margaret of Navarre, had been won to the reformed ideas when they seemed to mean a new freedom of the spirit. His mother, having as a young woman written graceful verses in the manner of sixteenth-century preciosity, had turned Protestant definitely just at the beginning of Protestantism's political significance in France. Not very happily married, firm, intense, clear-headed in an almost masculine manner, her passion came to center about her ambition for her son. Threading fearlessly and with great intelligence difficult, precarious, sometimes perilous situations, she finally placed her son a leader of the Protestant party. Then for almost twenty years circumstances made him *the* leader. The rôle opened naturally before him. He followed it, perhaps as steadily as one never a zealot could. He can hardly be said ever to have followed it in a Calvinist manner. With many excellent qualities, he had perhaps but one persistent vice; but it was one generously prohibited in the Mosaic decalogue upon which Calvin laid such emphasis. Circumstances made of him a Protestant, and circumstances were again to make of him a Catholic. We need not follow his battles. Something other than battles was happening, even in Paris, the stronghold of the Catholic league.

To understand completely the later fortunes of the league, we should be obliged to take account of the Council of Trent, and of the Jesuit Company's activities in Europe, consideration of which must unfortunately be postponed. Here we may but suggest that, before the last act of this religious-political struggle arrived, Roman Catholicism had planned and organized a defense which, so far as possible, ignored national boundary lines. This fact slowly penetrated the French consciousness—the League was not French, but an engine of the papacy. The papacy was prepared to seat, or unseat, rulers in France, proportionately as these rulers might or might not be expected to further the interest of the new Roman Catholicism. It had at least indirectly inspired, and many were prepared to believe had incited directly, the assassin of Henry III. The Jesuit Company was rather popularly believed to justify, if not inspire, the removal, by any means, of rulers anywhere in Europe who could not be counted upon to support the religion of the Roman papacy.

Indeed, almost from the moment of Henry III's assassination the party of the League began to split in at least three directions. The Guise faction wished to seat the Duc de Guise, the Spaniards, who had sent an army from the Low Countries, had a Bourbon candidate of Spanish extraction, and there were still others who believed that Henry of Navarre should be urged to change his religion, and until such an attempt had definitely failed no other monarch should be chosen. French patriotism began to awaken. The Spanish armed assistance was resented, as more likely to "disunite and destroy us than any other thing," and even suspected of the intent to "usurp and disorganize the State." [19] Not only was the unity of the league broken, but against its purpose public opinion began to solidify, and one of the remarkable monuments of French literature was to do much to solidify it: the *Satire Ménipée.* In this series of satires, the religion of the league was treated as a pretext, under which many and various purposes were hidden. This religion, to which was given the satiric name *Catholicon,* was described as a drug, a panacea, of marvelous potency, the discovery of a Spanish quack, who had leagued for a time with the Moors in Africa, of which country he had made himself king, by slyly pushing aside, and finally killing, the king, whose physician he had been. Then, returning to Spain, this wily practitioner had got himself baptized, and had joined the Jesuit Company.[20]

The virtues of this drug were many.

> Sow delicately a bit of *Higuiero* (Catholicon) everywhere, none will be disturbed, no one will dare gossip about it, fearing to be reputed a Huguenot.
>
> Settle down and install yourself tyrannically in the cities of the King . . . be villainous, renegade, perfidious; obey neither God, King, nor Law; have hidden in your fist a bit of Catholicon, get it preached in your neighborhood, and you will be a great and Catholic gentleman.
>
> If you want to be Cardinal right away, rub one of the horns of your bonnet with Higuiero; it will become red, and you will be made Cardinal, even though the most incestuous and ambitious prelate in the world.[21]

Every device was used to emphasize the foreign inspiration of the League. Imaginary speeches, framed to betray the speaker's hidden purposes, were written, some of them in Latin, or in Italian, to suggest that the speakers could not even speak French.

---

[19] Villeroy, "Mémoires d'Estat" (1574-1594), XLIV, 143, in *Collection Complète des Mémoires relatif à l'Histoire de France.*

[20] *Satire Ménepée*—Lettres du pouvoir d'un Espagnol, et des pouvoirs miraculeux de sa drogue, appelée Higuiero d'Infierno ou Catholicon Composé.

[21] *Ibid.*

The Guises, who had planned a genealogy to prove descent from the family of Charlemagne, as claimants to the throne, are told to take their claims to Germany, where they may perhaps be listened to:

Mais vous, Princes estrangers,
Qui nous mettez aux dangers
Et nous paissez de fumée
Tenants le guerre allumée,

Retournez en vos pays:
Trop au nostre estes haïs;
Et comptez de Charlemagne
Au lisieres d'Allemagne.

Prouvez-y par voz Romans,
Que venez des Carlomans:
Les bonnes gens après boire,
Quelque chose en pourront croire.[22]

Such was the growing atmosphere in which the League was to stifle. But this by no means meant Protestantism for France. The pressure upon Henry to change his religion began almost immediately after the death of Henry III, and continued persistently for five years. Henry IV temporized, but gradually slid from the fingers of the Huguenots. Two things were evident: his personal popularity was great, but on the other hand there was no peace for France under a Protestant ruler. He allowed himself to be *instructed* in the Catholic faith, then, after a period, made public abjuration of heresy, heard mass, was finally anointed king, not at Rheims, still held by the forces of the League, but at the second shrine of France, Chartres. And all this time he still rested under the excommunication of the pope. What gesture could more clearly have signified the French solution of her Catholicism? France was Catholic, but France was, first of all, French. As for the Protestants, the religious controversy ended for them very much as Catherine de Medici had again and again attempted to end it before, by a compromise. They were given a specified and somewhat limited freedom to publicly practice their cult, and all political disabilities were removed from them. The basis of this arrangement had already been laid down in an edict twenty-one years before,[23] when, in 1598, the Edict of Nantes was promulgated.

---

[22] "You foreign princes, who put us in jeopardy, pasture us on smoke, keeping the flame of war always ablaze, go back to your own country; and count on Charlemagne at the boundaries of Germany (the Guise were of Lorraine). Prove there by your romances (also play upon words with Romans, of papalists) that you descend from the Carolingians; and the good folk, after having drunk a bit, may believe something of your claims" (*Satire Ménepée*).

As for the papacy, they soon found it wise to accept the *fait accompli,* and send along the tardy absolution. Less than a year after the publication of the Edict of Nantes, following protests both from Catholic clergy and the *Parlement* of Paris, Henry was thundering at the *parlement:*

> Make no allegations on the score of the Catholic religion; I am more devoted to it than you, am more Catholic than you. I am the eldest son of the Church; none of you is, or can be that. You mistake yourself, if you think to stand well with the Pope; with him I stand better than you. Should I but take it in hand to do so, I could get you all declared heretic, for not wishing to obey me.[24]

Thus it was that France arranged her reformation, and returned to her old religious habits.

[23] De Vaissière, *Henri IV* (1925) calls attention to the relation between the Edict of Nantes and that of Poitiers, after the Peace of Bergerac, 488ff.

[24] De Vaissière, *Henri IV,* 493.

# XLVII

In Germany the Renaissance liberation of human individuality had been seized upon from the religious angle by Martin Luther, and the Reformation had begun as a religious movement, touching in a broad way German inwardness and religious sentiment. Political forces had then taken it up, and assured the fortunes of the movement, while the rising burgher spirit hardened its impulse into theological formulas, utilizing the new freedom in the economic and social, rather than the religious sphere. To France the Reformation had first come as a Lutheran impulse, connected with the Renaissance, then with the harder clearer lines of Calvinism. Here it was made a weapon in the struggle between powerful feudal nobles and the king; used and discarded. England's Reformation was to be of another, and not less distinctive brand.

England had finished her last feudal struggle earlier than France or Germany, in the fifteenth century with the Wars of the Roses. In this struggle the old noble houses had destroyed one another, and in doing so their own power. Many old families had become extinct, others had lost their wealth and been broken up. By deaths, losses, confiscations, many properties had changed hands, and as its aftermath came a fever of land speculation and lawsuits over property rights. Land ownership was still the basis of social distinction, wealthy members of the middle class had purchased landed estates, with which one was likely in England to push in among the nobility. In this way a new titled class was arising.

With this new nobility other dislocations of rural economy had come. The wool industry flourished to such extent that raising sheep was more profitable than raising crops. Fields became pastures, tenants no longer needed to till them were evicted; vagabondage became a tremendous problem; in some of England's richest counties the patriarchal relationship and good feeling between lord and tenant was disturbed.

There were other rumblings in the economic world. Industry and trade began to present troublesome problems, and before the fifteenth century ended there were many attempts to regulate business by law. Consumers complained that materials that used to wear two years "will not endure whole by the space of three months scarcely," though prices of these materials were greatly increased. There were attempts to fix prices and curtail foreign trade, while merchants and guildmasters sought legislation for the regulation of restless and discontented laborers.

Such preoccupations filled the foreground. The religious atmosphere had grown colder and more matter-of-fact. New monastic foundations, an excellent index of religious enthusiasm during the medieval period, were conspicuously lacking.[1] Church revenues had increased since the end of the thirteenth century about forty-five per cent, while those of the state had trebled.[2] Many small religious communities were very poor, some dissolved because of lack of resources. As vagabondage became a nuisance, monks came to be looked upon as the stubbornest sort of beggars: able-bodied men, who made a religious virtue of the fact that they did not "make their own way in the world." Towns and townspeople went about the task of dealing not at all superstitiously with ecclesiastical prerogatives. Debtors, for example, might possibly escape creditors by taking sanctuary upon Church property. Indeed during the fifteenth century a papal bull was obtained limiting the right of sanctuary in England. Even earlier some communities declared by enactment that the parish house, churchyard, and vicarage should be as other houses of freemen "particularly as to arrests and other matters." [3] A subpoena might be served upon a parish vicar, "on Trinity Sunday in his parish church, at matins time before all the substance of his parish." [4] The sheriff's officers might, with "great fray," attempt an arrest in the church

---

[1] Moreton, *La Réforme en Angleterre,* 120.

[2] *Ibid.,* 111.

[3] Green, *Town Life in the XV Century,* I, 355.

[4] *Paston Letters,* no. 409.

"at the time of the mass."[5] There were to be "none disguisings, nor harping, nor luting, nor singing, nor none loud disports" in the house of a widow, the Christmas following her lord's decease,[6] but there was also to be no squeamish nonsense, when it came to a matter of property rights. Clerics were in suit at law with other clerics and with laymen, monastic communities fought out claims against one another and against civil communities, in a time when the propertied seem generally to have had some lawsuit in hand.

People had long known a measure of disgust with clerical abuses, both monastic and secular, but the situation was hardly worse than elsewhere in Europe. Visitations might any time discover a lax or licentious monastery; a bishop might fatten his purse selling his clergy what amounted to virtual license for concubinage; prelates and canons more often made even little pretense of serving the "livings" from which they drew incomes, and accumulated as many such incomes as possible. Such was the case everywhere in Europe. There was still a scattering of discipline and piety among parochial clergy, some bishops possessed pastoral zeal. An undercurrent of the Lollard enthusiasms for piety and Bible reading still existed among the simple and the poor. The *commons* would in places "smatter in matters of divinity," at the risk of breeding heresy.[7] But in general the heat of religious disgust appears largely to have burned away, in the Wycliffe movement, which in the end had frightened people of substance with revolutionary social doctrine. The colder feeling carried with it little interest in theological formulas. Even when the reform ideas penetrated Lutheran doctrines of justification by faith, Calvinist doctrines of election appear to have aroused little interest, even among the pious. Indeed, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, the English, never much interested in ideas or theories, appeared to have felt much like the character in *Piers Ploughman* who having first sought the *truth* from each of the four Orders of Friars, turns from them all, disillusioned:

---

[5] *Ibid.*, no. 18.

[6] *Ibid.*, no. 441.

[7] Dudley, *The Tree of Commonwealth*.

Although this flaterynge freres
Wyln, for her pryde,
Disputen of Godes deyte,
As dotardes shulden,
The more the matere is moved
The masedere hi werthen.
Lat the loseles alone,
And leve thou the trowthe;
For these maystres of dyvynite
Many, als I trowe,
Folwen nought fully the faith,
As fele of the lewede.[8]

Bitter differences and struggles between popes and monarchs were no strange thing in England. In the twelfth century an archbishop of Canterbury, backed by the pope, had been murdered at the altar, in a struggle which finally brought Henry II, the English monarch, a penitent to Rome.[9] John Lackland, in the thirteenth century, had locked horns with Innocent III, in a struggle over papal temporalities, to lose, and to hand over his lands to the pope, receiving them back as a papal vassal. A century and a half later Edward III, profiting by the loss of prestige of the papacy then at Avignon, and as part of a general vexation in England over papal pecuniary demands, had repudiated this vassalage, and ceased to pay the feudal tax then laid upon the realm. Few Englishmen wished to see a pope meddling in English affairs, but by the sixteenth century there was no longer much danger of his doing so in a disturbing way. And people generally did not hold, either passionately for papal supremacy, as symbol of some unity in Christian doctrine or practice, or against it passionately, as contrary to Scripture. But both papacy and hierarchy were hallowed institutions of long standing, against which it might have seemed difficult to move the English mass in any revolutionary way.

Humanism had come to England, toward the very end of the fifteenth century; to the universities, where the training had become a mere pretense. "A master's degree could be obtained by a year's study, and boys of ten or twelve passed through Oxford or Cambridge," as the necessary prelude to receiving religious livings which had been procured for them.[10] These English humanists had, with few exceptions, returned from Italy with the new enthusiasm. In 1496 one of them, John Colet, returned with religious zeal, and a new message, derived from studies of the New Testament. The spirit of the lectures he began to deliver upon the Epistles of Paul appears to have been remarkable, even in that moment of revived study of the New Testament. He felt strongly the personal attraction of Paul, through his letters, and his interpretation of the substance and style of these letters glowed with the affection for him he had formed. Also his earnestness, eloquence, and human sympathy had been sweetened by enthusiasm for the writings of a Florentine student of Plato.

---

[8] "Although these flattering friars will, in their pride, dispute about God's divinity, as dotards may, the more the matter is disputed the more mixed up they become. Let the good-for-nothings alone and believe thou the truth, for these masters of divinity, many of them I assure you, follow not so fully the faith as many of the laity," *The Creed of Piers Ploughman,* 1640ff.

[9] The case of Thomas à Becket.

Into this movement Erasmus was to be drawn, having come to England to learn Greek, because he could not afford to go elsewhere and had been told he would find generous patronage in England. He found more Greek than generous patronage, and was, as we know, not in the end to go the way of the Reformation. Another rare spirit, Thomas More, was drawn into the circle, his broad and delicate sympathies spreading so wide that no religious movement might altogether hold them, and he was also, in a tragic way, to refuse to go the way of the Reformation, as it was destined to go in England. And so this religious enthusiasm bred of the Italian humanism, coming to Oxford with Colet, in a large sense died with him, and with the Utopia of Sir Thomas More, before the English Reformation had begun. In fact Colet was hardly fitted to be the leader of a popular religious revolution, and the proper home of his religious reform was perhaps Utopia, just as these ideals of the *Oxford Reformers* became, in memory and tradition, the Utopia of the Anglican Church. We need not sketch their aspirations here.[11] The temper of the movement was, in the best sense, English, but it did not grow into, nor was it with continuity and directness to influence the Reformation which followed by some fifteen years the death of Colet.

---

[10] Fisher, in *Political History,* V, 132.

[11] This incident of English religious history has been winningly recounted by Frederick Seebohm, *The Oxford Reformers.*

So had the Renaissance come to England. It has been said that, with the death of Henry VII and the crowning of his son Henry VIII, the Middle Ages came to an end in England.[12] But the Renaissance, however many other things it was, was hardly a religious reformation, nor was it any part of the plan of Henry VIII, who shared many of its enthusiasms and had been in part formed by its intellectual aspirations, to join the two. The Renaissance came to England very largely as new interest in science, new and bitter criticism of Scholasticism, broader interest in literature. The feelings of the people were not immediately to be so touched as to react in a creative art impulse of their own. Such was to come late in the sixteenth century, the problem of the Reformation, apparently, out of the way and settled. Indeed, when we have noted the particular character of the English Reformation, it will become clearer and clearer that, save for a considerable measure of popular indifference in the matter of religion, it hardly could have come at all in the form in which it came.

On the other hand, a ruler who had begun in his reign under unusually favorable circumstances, and with great personal popularity, based upon abilities beyond the average of kings—a real largeness of spirit, susceptibilities which, as a young man, might be touched by fine and generous impulses, faults and virtues both of a sort sympathetic to Englishmen—had many long-standing elements of discontent, both economic and religious (or ecclesiastical), and also a rapidly growing national consciousness, ready on occasion to raise the cry *England for Englishmen* and club the heads of foreign London residents, to fall in behind him, even to the point of schism with Rome, when he determined to be rid of a wife with strong and powerful papal connections.

Such, in brief, were the indirect antecedents of the Anglican Schism which, scarcely a reformation, was to unloose a slow process of religious-political revolution hardly to be arrested for considerably more than a century and a half.

[12] Brewer, *Henry VIII,* I, 1.

Considered in some of its aspects, the sixteenth century, with the last years of the fifteenth, might be well called one of the most disheartening eras in European history. The medieval institutions, which aimed to bind men together by appeal to fidelity, which in theory tied all social status or privilege to social function and responsibility, and in which every function was a religious duty, now existed for little save exploitation. The Church exploited, princes exploited, nobles exploited, the merchants and master artisans who had come to control the guilds exploited. The middle class more and more clamored for its "rights," the poor more and more needed protection. Against a background of renewed interest in the world, in science, art, and letters; the awakening with new and freer energy of middle-class thrift and industry; a prodigality of luxury and magnificence unknown in Europe since the ancient world, there was a greed and rapacity in rulers, whose luxurious tastes had outstripped their incomes, a coldness and duplicity of craft, a hardness at every point where sentiment crossed material and political interest, which bent scruples, twisted principles, retaining old forms of binding *oaths* one did not pretend to keep when they had become inconvenient, and chivalric formalities which had become a mockery.

That such a century should have been one of religious revolution in Europe is one of the strange ironies of Europe's history. That out of a marriage arrangement contracted in this atmosphere, and as sordid a marriage arrangement as was made even in this century, a religious breach between England and Rome should have arisen, is no incongruous parcel of this century's history.

> Henry VII, upon wise and good considerations, resolved to link himself in a close confederation with Ferdinand and Isabella, kings of Castile and Aragon, and with the house of Burgundy, against France, which was looked upon as the lasting and dangerous enemy of England. And therefor a marriage was agreed on between his son, Prince Arthur, and Catherine, the Infanta of Spain. There was given with her 200,000 ducats, the greatest portion that had ever been given for many ages with any princess.[13]

[13] Burnet, *History of the Reformation,* I, ii.

Bishop Burnet does not even hint the deep mutual mistrust which aimed to doubly safeguard every step of this transaction. He does not even suggest the many years during which Henry VII and Ferdinand watched each other's fortunes, while negotiations went on, lest one or the other might prove to have got less by the bargain than he hoped; or how but one of three promised installments had been paid when the marriage finally took place, and how this installment was immediately demanded back again when Arthur died. He rather goes on to tell how the marriage took place, and how Arthur, "a strong and healthful youth," immediately consummated the marriage, "which in a youth of sixteen years of age, that was vigorous, was not at all judged strange," and how proofs of this consummation were forwarded to Spain, all of which proves not to have been true, but which it later served the purpose of Henry VIII that people should believe.[14]

Upon the death of Arthur the political situation in Spain had changed, leaving doubt as to the wisdom of marrying his widow to Henry. She was, however, not allowed to leave England, while negotiations began for another marriage for the prince. This in the end came to nothing, and after more haggling, the virgin widow Catherine was wedded to her brother-in-law. Such a marriage was within the bounds of the Church's ban of prohibition, but a dispensation was easily procured from the pope. This dispensation was to offer the pretext upon which the Reformation in England was to rest.

Catherine was a faithful, obedient, and pious wife. More than this, she had inherited considerable of the ability of her mother, Queen Isabella of Spain, and was capable of acting with energy and wisdom when for a short time the reins of government were in her hands. She did not for long, however, provide Henry with an heir. Two sons died soon after birth, several times hopes were disappointed by miscarriages, and, after twelve years it was a daughter, not a son, she bore him.

The Princess Mary became the apple of Henry's eye. She was also a marketable apple. Before she was two years old Henry was in treaty with the King of France for her marriage to an heir not yet born.

---

[14] Gairdner, *History of the English Church in the Sixteenth Century,* 84, 93.

Henry kept alive all the forms of piety. He heard from three to five masses per day, attended Vespers and Complines in the queen's apartments. When Luther's attack on the papacy appeared, Henry took his pen in hand to indite a refutation, earning in gratitude from the pope the title of *Defender of the Faith,* which his Protestant successors continued, and still continue, to bear. At this period Henry prided himself upon his legs and his learning, not to speak of a number of other things. He talked Latin fluently, also French, understood Italian, played several musical instruments, dabbled in philosophy and theology. He was also an excellent marksman with bow and arrow, enthusiastic at tennis, and good at tilting. His talents were not depreciated by courtiers and visiting ambassadors. He soon became a much-flattered prince, who courted comparison with the young and brilliant King of France, Francis I. This was not altogether a good omen, since Francis was at bottom more frivolous, and could give him lessons in profligacy. Then he found an excellent and able minister (Wolsey), who added to his ability a willingness to work. It became less and less necessary for Henry to give persistent attention to affairs of state, and there were many diversions.

He launched upon warlike adventures, not very successfully at first. One thing he soon learned: that Parliament was often a nuisance when one was obliged to ask for money, and taxes, even when granted, had a way of yielding far below estimate. Something further he was to learn, from his efficient minister, Wolsey. Wolsey had accumulated a number of lucrative ecclesiastical benefices, culminating in the archbishopric of York, not to mention the emoluments of a Lord Chancellor, and pensions given him by foreign princes whose ends it was hoped he would further. He lived in state second only to that of the king. Among his princely benefactions had been foundations of two colleges, endowed by dissolving moribund monastic communities and directing their incomes to this educational end. Complaint was made against him at an embarrassing moment, he made humble apology, which was accepted; but Henry VIII did not forget the lesson learned.

There were a number of things which Henry was to learn in the early part of his reign which became useful knowledge later on. In a turn of complicated European politics the emperor, Charles V, sacked Rome and captured the pope. It was rumored that France and England were about to separate from Rome, and London did not react unfavorably to this rumor. Even earlier, in a troublesome case of possible murder by clerics, Henry's law advisors had rendered the opinion that, in cases of felony, even though the accused were a cleric, the case might be tried by a secular court. The king was unquestioned fountain of secular justice, and his sense of his prerogatives even where clerics were concerned was not weakened by this discovery.

While Henry was accumulating information as to rifts in the Church's armor, together with comforting assurances as to the extent of his own prerogatives, a situation was arising in which he was still for a long time to feel the need of the pope's assistance. Henry had thus far been, according to standards of contemporary princes, a very decent sort of husband. The Queen was in many things his political confidante, and was treated always with respect. He had had amours, but there was but one recognized bastard, who had been made Duke of Richmond in 1525, with princely household and lands. There was, however, but the Princess Mary between his lawful succession and a possible revival of the Wars of the Roses. No further children had been born of his marriage, and meanwhile a certain Anne Boleyn (or Bullen) had appeared at court. Her father was a knight upon the rise. Her older sister had married at court and been the king's mistress. Anne had been dispatched to France a child, had served for a time in the suite of Queen Claude, the much neglected wife of Francis I. She returned polished with arts and graces, and just the bit of a French accent when she talked English. She was young, handsome, gay, sang well, and danced even better. She captivated, perhaps fell in love with, the son and heir of the Earl of Northumberland, a promising match. There was a secret betrothal. Henry, however, had already seen her, and when this affair got to the point of a written contract of engagement, Henry stepped in and forbade the marriage. The job was given to Wolsey. He did not perform it with particular gentleness or delicacy, and this was perhaps the beginning of war between Anne Bullen and the great cardinal.

It gradually began to leak out that the king had some "secret matter" to request of the pope. Wolsey knew, and then the rumor passed to Spain and France, that Henry was beginning to worry as to the legitimacy of his marriage with his brother's widow. The approach to this matter was complicated, since Henry was still contemplating and planning a French marriage, or some other brilliant marriage, for the Princess Mary, whose legitimacy, and therefore desirablility in brilliant marriages, would be much affected by any disturbance as to the propriety of Henry's marriage with her mother. Alternatives were considered. It might be possible to get the pope to authorize a second marriage without the dissolution of the first.

It is not probable that Wolsey knew, when first he attempted to get papal sanction of a divorce between Catherine and Henry, what were his master's marital plans. However, having learned, he was too good a servant to diminish his efforts, particularly in so much as he was not popular at court—an upstart in the eyes of the nobles of old family; an arrogant, scheming, rich, competent, and vastly influential upstart, to interview whom one was obliged first to pass through eight sumptuous antechambers. Henry was the sole thread by which hung his fortune, even the head upon his shoulders.

But, behind this "secret matter" with the pope was an infatuation for Anne Bullen, which she was by no means minded to assuage short of becoming queen. Her imperious hold over him, combined with his own headstrong passion, drove him on. Many means were tried, or considered. The news sifted to Catherine that Henry planned to be rid of her. Anne's ascendancy grew. Henry still treated his wife with formal decency, but Anne had attained a position at court hardly second to hers. She was able to separate to a considerable extent Henry from the Princess Mary, despite the deep affection he had for her. Worried by the difficulties he met with in effecting a divorce, he wished audibly the marriage never had taken place, only to add that this would have been a pity because of the princess, "who was one of the most beautiful and virtuous ladies of the world."[15]

Then finally came permission from the pope to try the case of the validity of Henry's marriage in England, and giving Henry the right, in case the marriage was declared void, to marry again; also declaring that in any case the legitimacy of the Princess Mary was not to be injured by a divorce. But here Catherine proved the barrier. Summoned to appear before the appointed judges she proudly and firmly denied their jurisdiction, appealed to Rome, and stalked from the room. After some time spent leisurely in taking evidence the case was adjourned, and meanwhile Catherine's relatives succeeded in getting the case removed for trial to Rome.[16] " 'By the mass,' cried milord Suffolk, striking his fist upon the table, 'now I see that the old saying is true, that never in England has a legate or a Cardinal done anything good.' "[17]

At this turn of events, the very thing he had wished to avoid, Henry was for a time despondent. Yet, had he but collected his thoughts, and cogitated upon some former experiences, it might immediately have occurred to him that there were few things which would so much excuse in England his wish to divorce a wife who had much sympathy, of English women particularly, as this attempt to settle an English affair in Rome. "It is intended," a diplomat wrote to his royal master, "to hold a parliament here this winter, and then act by their own absolute power, in default of justice being administered by the Pope in the divorce."[18] Such was the solution, after a number of gestures. But this was not all the solution. A young clergyman by the name of Thomas Cranmer had said that the question might be taken for opinions to the universities of Europe. This suggestion made the fortunes of this young clergyman. Henry declared that he had "the right sow by the ears." There was some difficulty at home, both with Oxford and Cambridge, though in the end they got into line. From Orléans, Paris, Angers, Bourges, Bologna, Padua, and Toulouse came favorable opinion.[19] Then Parliament met, packed with care by Henry with his own nominees, for the particular purpose of considering the "enormities of the clergy." The air of its meeting became full of clerical abuses, and then Henry had read the opinions of the universities in the matter of his divorce. It was charged that Parliament's cry was "Down with the Church," and Parliament resented the charge.

---

[15] Stone, *Mary the First, Queen of England,* 43.

[16] *Cambridge Modern History,* II, 432; Constant, *La Réforme en Angleterre* (1930), 34.

[17] Constant, *La Réforme en Angleterre,* 34.

[18] *Political History of England,* V, 287.

Meanwhile Anne Bullen had already got Wolsey into a minor disgrace with the king. Now Henry "discovered" that Wolsey had for long illegally exercised the power of a papal legate in England, and that, since the Church in England had generally recognized that he exercised this power, the convocations both of Canterbury and York were guilty with him. Wolsey saved going to the scaffold by dying. But when the chapter of Canterbury came to pay their way out of their guilt it was again "discovered" that they could not make the necessary grant to the king, unless they recognized him as "the sole protector and supreme head of the Church and Clergy of England." So far as breach with the pope was concerned, matters seemed less difficult than he might have imagined. The greater difficulties which were to be feared seemed the probability that such breach might involve him in a war with the Catholic monarchs of the Continent, and the certainty that the idea of a marriage between himself and Anne would be taken in an unfriendly way in England. Anne was neither liked nor respected by the English generally, and Catherine had sympathy everywhere, openly shown when occasion arose.

But matters were to glide, with several events pushing. The House of Commons was a bit afraid lest breach with Rome might result in an interdict, cutting off commerce with important parts of the Continent, but in the end they bent under. He had previously "discovered" that the prelates of his realm were but half his subjects, since they owed a partial allegiance to Rome, and at Parliament's suggestion a *submission* was arranged. This submission at the same time caused the resignation of the Chancellor, Sir Thomas More, and later cost him his head, in protest.

---

[19] Gairdner, *History of the English Church in the Sixteenth Century,* 105, 111.

In the meantime Anne Bullen had become Marchioness of Pembroke, and the year of the *submission* she crossed with Henry to France, and was complimented by Francis I upon her skill in dancing. At the beginning of the next year she was "in good expectations," and Henry married her secretly. He had already obtained from his clergy in convocation opinion favorable to his divorce. That Easter eve Anne went to mass in state and was declared queen. Something over a month later came the decree of a convocation of English divines declaring his marriage to Catherine void. In September Elizabeth was born.

All these things were a direct defiance to the pope. Excommunication was bound to follow. Some six weeks after the coronation of Anne it came, but with three months' grace, during which Henry might repent and avoid it. September passed, making the excommunication effective. Two months later Parliament met and confirmed Henry as head of the English Church. The breach with Rome was now complete, irreparable. The prelates, clergy, the people in Parliament assembled, were all involved and committed with him. Proceeding little by little, and with no serious misstep, Henry had through a maze of wires and cross wires, sometimes doubting, not always sure of direction, yet going cautiously, succeeded, doubtless beyond his expectations.

Other events soon followed. At the beginning of 1536 Catherine died. "God be praised, we are now free of all fear of war!" Henry exclaimed. The mourning worn by himself and Queen Anne was yellow, and Henry danced the next day at court. Anne did not dance. The day of Catherine's funeral she had a miscarriage, which shortened her span of life. Henry was long since tired of her, and it was said at court that they scarcely spoke ten times in three months. Hardly more than three months later she was in the Tower, charged with adultery with four paramours, and with incest with her brother. People generally disliked her so much they were ready even to believe the latter more than improbable charge. All six were promptly executed.

Henry had already begun to experiment with Wolsey's plan of making more practical use of monastic properties. In his hands, and with the assistance of one Thomas Cromwell, who had already assisted Wolsey in similar transactions, it proved a lucrative experiment. The plan of expropriating the smaller monastic communities had been formed before the death of Anne. This fact however was not generally known, and Henry now being without a wife, his marriage having shortly after been declared null by Thomas Cranmer, now Archbishop of Canterbury, there were many who expected a movement upon his part for reconciliation with Rome. To return to union with Rome and to despoil monasteries on a large scale were two things that could hardly go together successfully. Instead, a representative of Cromwell, now Henry's chief minister, took the presiding chair in Convocation, the Church of England's legislative body. This was irregular, but was accepted, as very probably return to Rome would then have been acquiesced in at least.

Henry was now in a position of unique convenience, so far as religion was concerned. He could condemn papal sympathizers for treason, if they refused to accept him as head of the Church, and he could condemn equally determined reformers as heretics. He did both, three of each being on one occasion put to the death at the same time, in the same place.[20]

So far as religious legislation was concerned with doctrine it was colorless. It made no clear breach with Catholic theology, nor could Lutherans much object to it. Yet, to condemn "superstitious practices" aided in arousing a sort of public opinion which made his spoliation of monasteries more easily digested. A wonder-working image, with eyes and lips which might be made to move with wires, was taken up to London, exposed to ridicule, flung among the crowd, and smashed to pieces. For a time the king, while publicly repressing radical religious doctrine, privately encouraged it. An English translation of the Bible appeared in

---

[20] *Ibid.*, 218.

England, for the most part the same translation condemned but a few years earlier. Cromwell and Cranmer, under Henry the heads of Church and State, both favored it. Bible readers in this period were very contemptuous of crucifixes and images, and the public became accustomed, in London and some larger towns, to see them and hear them insulted. Then, suddenly, came "an act abolishing diversity in opinions," intended to check heretical utterances previously surreptitiously encouraged. Cranmer, who had married a wife in 1532, was obliged to dismiss her in 1539; and two years later a zealous English Protestant wrote that one might travel throughout England, without finding a single preacher who sought "the glory of God . . . with faith unfeigned," in evangelical fashion.

In all this, save for the fact that England had now its church, separate from Rome, it was difficult to see religion playing an important rôle. Sir Thomas More had once advised Cromwell, his successor as chancellor, ever to tell Henry what he ought to do, but never what he is able to do. . . . For if a lion knew his strength, hard were it for any man to rule him." The lion had learned his strength. He did not use it altogether unwisely, but he used it ruthlessly. To say that he used it unscrupulously is to waste words, when one is speaking of sixteenth-century politics. Some religious changes of permanent influence had come, but they little affected doctrine. Of all doctrine the one against which popular opinion was most easily aroused was that of Purgatory, for by means of this doctrine much money has been extracted from lay pockets. Masses for the dead, penances, and pilgrimages were called "purgatory pick-purse exactions." So far as doctrine was concerned Henry himself had been bred upon, and to a degree educated in medieval doctrine; was even vain of his theological knowledge. Save at times where it pleased him for political reasons to give the reformers a little loose rein, his own opinions were conservative enough. The significant fact was his ability to move the religious barometer up and down, seemingly at will, and with surprisingly little friction among a people always very zealous for their "rights." This was done by his control of the

House of Commons, in part because he was able to exercise very large influence in the election of its members, and because it was more and more filled with *new men,* rich merchants and prominent lawyers, themselves jealous of the old prerogatives which in a large measure linked the Church and the older landed aristocracy. Both in Church and State the conservative influence had greatly weakened. While these new men did not represent the old religious zeal, neither did they represent the new. It was on the books clearly written, everywhere in Europe, that the Church was soon to lose many of its old landed endowments. What was happening in England, so far as monastic properties were concerned, was happening in Germany. In France it was happening by the somewhat different expedient of granting the revenues of monasteries to lay favorites of the monarch. Religious revolution in England had no theology, no common interest to bind it together, no outstanding leader. Indeed, were one to look for a popular movement in which united religious zeal was represented during the period immediately following Henry's breach with Rome, he would find it in one of violent reaction toward old religious habits and institutions, which broke out in the north of England.

In 1536 three sorts of commissioners were sent into the North: 1. in connection with a tax collection; 2. to check up monasteries for looting, 3. to investigate conditions among the clergy. These investigations brought revolt that grew into armed rebellion. An assembly met at York, passed resolutions to burn all heretical books, to restore the abbeys which had been despoiled, and some other matters. The punishment of a number of persons high in the counsels of the King was suggested, as subverters of law, and supporters of heresy. Behind this program was a force of forty thousand men, who needed perhaps nothing so much as leadership of zealous conviction. Henry sent to treat with them; promised pardon and a *free parliament* to consider their resolutions. Parliaments in Henry's reign were not believed to be precisely free. These negotiations did not end, but they broke the front of this rebellion. The promises of the King were not kept. A considerable number of the leaders were hanged, and the free parliament never met to consider the resolutions. The dissolution of the monasteries went on apace. These monastic properties passed into the hands of many of the landed gentry, creating a class later to have very solid reasons for not wishing to see Henry's reformation undone. And meanwhile, despite an entering wedge in ritual reform, and a partial introduction of England into the church services, Henry considered himself, save as to the authority of the pope, a good Catholic. German divines, coming to England to arrange a plan of union, returned disappointed. The English insisted upon retaining private masses, clerical celibacy, the reservation of the *cup* in Communion to the priesthood only. These "papal idolatries" were a basic minimum with Lutherans, and no compromise was possible.

With Henry's death, Jane Seymour's son, Anne's successor as his wife, came to the throne as Edward VI. He was but nine years old. Periods of regency in realms governed according to sixteenth-century theories were inevitably troublesome affairs. Jane Seymour had died soon after Edward's birth. Her brothers took affairs in hand, with the assistance of a council bequeathed by Henry. These brothers were of very different character, but both made trouble in different ways. One married Henry's widow, Katherine Parr, with rather indecent haste. The other made a well-intentioned attempt to grant large liberty in religious matters. Now Protestantism was to have an inning. Prominent Protestant leaders from the Continent hurried to England. Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, had prepared a prayer book. One, and then a second was during Edward's reign adopted. The religious confusion increased. With it the indifference of the gentry, shocked into a very negative sort of tolerance, increased. Religious discussion and dispute increased. London was becoming increasingly Protestant, and as much might be said for many of the larger towns. With no distinct positive doctrine to build around, it was largely a radical antipathy for practices which could not be warranted in Scripture, and were condemned and ridiculed as "papist." Many powerful nobles had become Erastian (ready to accept unquestioningly the religion preferred by the ruler). Generally among the nobles there were, with the Erastians and the indifferents, not a few zealous Catholics, and some Protestants. There was also Protestant reënforcement among those who had come into possession of lands taken from the monasteries, and wished no reunion with Rome to disturb their title to these possessions. The peasantry generally were little touched by new religious ideas. So far as the pope was concerned, it little mattered to them whether he were Pope or Bishop of Rome, but old habits and beliefs still stayed the same.

The liberal policies at the beginning of the reign of Edward VI loosed some disorder, and worked a reaction, that proved however a less serious reaction than was feared. Then, after a reign of but six years, when still but a lad, Edward VI died.

The death of Edward might well have seemed the moment for revolution. The next claimant was the Princess Mary, daughter of the unfortunate Catherine of Aragon, who had been officially declared a bastard, who was half Spanish, and who had never made any pretense of being other than a good Catholic, whose religious loyalty did not make any exception so far as the pope was concerned. The revolution arose, and fell like a house of cards before the popularity of the Princess Mary. The Princess Mary had never lost the sympathy of the people, through all her preceding unfortunate years. And few, perhaps, of English monarchs have better deserved it, save for the one unfortunate fact that she put the eternal salvation of her subjects before every other thing, and was firmly convinced that this salvation, for them as for herself, rested in reunion with the historic Church.

Mary had been advised by her uncle, the Emperor Charles V, to go slowly in the matter of reunion with Rome. He was no such religious enthusiast as Mary herself, but she followed his advice, and before two years had passed, both the House of Lords and the House of Commons unanimously passed a resolution to return to communion with the Roman Church.

Mary was a queen altogether in the medieval manner. Against the rising tide of Puritanism, she loved gorgeous robes and jewels. She knew far less than her half sister was later to know, of what went on in the offices and heads of those who sat in her House of Commons, when they were by no means debating concerning "the good of her realm." She hardly understood the many ways in which the good of the realm mixed with the more permanent vocations of these legislators. She was a queen in grace, as queens go in beauty, and in accomplishments certainly. Her principles were not always the most broad, but she had principles, and was scarcely to be moved from them. Her dignity and deep sincerity won many battles for her. Her mercy, which she found it easier to use with political enemies than against heretics, probably helped her not at all as a ruler. But, if she knew little of counting houses, which were growing in political importance, she knew the cottages of the poor, and among the country poor where she had passed her gentle sympathy was never forgotten, even when she began to be called "Bloody Mary."

Mary was perhaps never born to marry, and her years of persecution, trouble, and sorrow had postponed even the thought of it, until her fortieth year approached. Prayerfully she decided that she should, for the good of her realm, in hope of offspring, wed with Philip, the son of Charles V.

Whether or not Mary could ever have got through her reign without serious trouble unmarried, her marriage to a Spanish prince was the inevitable beginning of new difficulties. England was not yet among the first powers of Europe; that was only to come under her half sister Elizabeth. But England was most decidedly feeling her oats. Mary was too deeply loyal to her subjects to have planned to sell them out to strangers, but the greatest care in the power of human beings (and both Mary and Philip exercised personally great care) could not remove the suspicion that England might be about to be tied to the tail of Spain, then at the summit of her glory.

The marriage of Mary caused an almost immediate cloud over the atmosphere in which her reign commenced. Then followed persecution of those who balked at return to Rome. Somewhere in the neighborhood of two hundred and fifty persons (not many in a nation which some twenty years before had made a momentous change in its religious arrangements, and in a time when heresy and treason were almost certain to mix together) suffered martyrdom.

The air became gloomy, glowering. Unhappiness again shut itself around the Queen, who had known so much of it. Her hopes of offspring, repeatedly bred of her desire, repeatedly disappointed, saddened her, helped to bring indifference, neglect, desertion practically, on the part of her husband. The populace insulted her, almost openly. The expenses of the monarchy increased tremendously, and much of this money escaped the realm, to go to help Philip in his wars with France, even, as an added sadness to Mary, with the pope. Fortunately for Mary, and for England, she died, before a serious storm had broken.

We need hardly follow further the political fortunes of the Reformation in England. Storms were not over, but Roman allegiance was no longer in the offing. The best Rome could do was to complicate political conditions, and the fate of another Queen Mary (of Scotland). Elizabeth had outwardly *conformed* with Mary's return of the realm to Roman allegiance. She had done so in a way that left no serious doubt in anybody's mind but that it was done for expediency. Parliament, which had voted England back to Rome, pronounced a new religious divorce, and would have Elizabeth "Supreme Head" of the Church. This honor Elizabeth considered unessential, and she was well content to remain but the practical head.

Just what were Elizabeth's religious views no one ever knew. She read Latin, Greek, even Hebrew. This reading had not bred religious enthusiasm, and some suspected it had bred a complete skepticism. At all events, she was first of all English. Whatever her religious reticence, she let it be known to her subjects that she was English bred, on both sides, the most English sovereign of England for several generations. England still continued to meddle in intrigue with which religion was mixed up upon the Continent, but this meddling was hardly more serious than a long succession of arrangements of marriage, which Elizabeth doubtless early knew need never come to anything, since (though she did not share this secret with her subjects) she might not hope for an heir, and therefore a marriage would be but a useless complication.

And so, while Elizabeth perhaps knew no better than her father how to handle the English, she was to have a less complicated situation in which to handle them. Meanwhile she might do what he had been a little too early to do: direct the attention of adventurous souls off toward new opportunities of wealth which had been discovered across various seas by bold navigators. This new world had, to be sure, been more or less divided by the pope between Spain and Portugal, and they had begun the task of occupying their new territories. "Elizabeth might and did, like Mary, prohibit illicit exploration, and issue proclamation against pirates; but Mary meant her threats, and Elizabeth did not, except as sops to irate victims of the pillage.[21] The foreign policy of the State now centered in the counting houses of London's merchants and bankers. So long as this continued to be the case there could be no serious religious disturbance in England, and it was to be shunted over until relations between London and the Monarch had become less friendly.

---

[21] *Political History of England,* VI, 305.

# XLVIII

THE Reformation in England, as we have seen, was born of a struggle between the will of a sixteenth-century king, carrying his people to the point of open schism upon the basis of a personal interest, and the exigencies of a sixteenth-century pope, bound to balance and to take account of the power of sixteenth-century princes. Primarily it settled for England, after some oscillation, the conflict of Church and State in that form in which this century inherited it from the Middle Ages. Politically the result of this contest was clear, and politically it was almost universally satisfactory to England's citizenry. Religiously the result was a compromise, representing the ardor of no sect or religious party, inspired by no zealous religious leader. Of this compromise the Church of England was begotten. As an English diplomat said of it in 1570, "Divine service in England did not properly compel any man to alter his opinion in the great matters being now in controversy in the church."[1]

None the less it would be a mistake to assume that there was no religious ardor in England, or that such religious ardor was unable, underneath this compromise, to effect any changes which went in the direction of religious revolution such as the sixteenth century aspired to bring about. As a matter of fact a national Church, not based upon any deeply grounded theological premises, but rather representing a doctrinal fluidity in which no parties had as yet defined themselves, might undertake many reforms welcomed on the Continent at the beginning of the Reformation, by an uncountable number both of clergy and laity who had not the slightest intention of severing their allegiance to Rome, and to the traditional hierarchy. Most, if not all, of these things, as the subtle instincts of the Curia soon perceived, could not be reformed without danger to the stability of that ecclesiastical structure about which the Middle Ages had slowly built. Medieval doctrine, for example, had built around sacramental and quasi-sacramental prerogatives of the clergy. Subsequently, and as the result of another complex of factors, this clergy had begun to build more closely, and was still to build more closely afterwards, about the papacy. Also, this clergy, having long exercised their sacramental powers unquestioned, with little or no theoretical support of an apologetic nature, had begun to knit into a developing theological system. Then, when heresy arose to popular influence, and heresy which was from the standpoint of its popular appeal more than anything anticlerical—a widespread questioning of the assumption that the salvation offered Christians came to them exclusively, or essentially, through the instrumentality of a priestly class—sacramental prerogatives came to have such need of a supporting doctrinal system as they never before had had. It had become for more dangerous than such a man as Erasmus imagined to touch this doctrinal system anywhere.

---

[1] Walsingham, on a diplomatic mission in France, *English Political History,* VI, 214.

This was particularly true because of the last step, in which the whole body of clerical prerogative had erected, for the contemplation and edification of the European world, that mounting hierarchy which ended in a supreme head of Christendom, the pope. At the moment of the Reformation, lay princes had a clearly defined area of political freedom which might interfere with their loyalty to this pope. Lay citizens had at best a divided loyalty, as national aspirations become conscious and coherent, and economic life began to free itself more and more from habits and conceptions which aimed to subordinate economic impulse to other worldly hopes, upon which hopes the Church's paramount influence over the individual was based. As a result of such opening clefts in the loyalty of princes and lay citizens, the pope was coming more and more to have but one body of Christians upon whose loyalty he might hope to count as remaining single to him. A pope of the Reformation period was bound, when dealing with European populations generally, to consider nationalistic interests and sympathies. When dealing with European princes he was bound, if he wished to succeed in his policies, to balance secular powers, and practice diplomacy. It therefore became necessary to bind, so far as in any way possible, all the clergy of Christendom to him personally, as the only body of Christians he might longer even hope to unite in single loyalty to his person and office.

This fact was soon to be perceived, very clearly perceived in fact, and to underlie all the policies of that Counter Reformation which we shall later follow. And it was this fact which made impracticable many of the compromises of refor mwhich, at the beginning, had seemed not only acceptable, but very desirable, to not a few good Catholics. To have allowed, for example, the Roman clergy to marry, would have been a step to loosen this single allegiance of theirs. To have allowed, as even a decision of the Council of Trent left possible, the communion of laity and clergy in both elements (bread and wine) would to this extent have assimilated the clergy to the laity. To have put the Bible freely into the hands of all Christians, to have ceased to require auricular confession or to exact sacramental penance, to have definitely thrown overboard indulgences, would have been to remove instrumentalities with which papal power might still cross national boundary lines in tangible form. Even so seemingly slight a matter as the continued use of Latin in the ritual, helped a unified ecclesiastic power, more tenuous than once it had been, retain substantiality.

A national Church had no such difficulty. The basis of tangible religious unity was clearly defined, on the basis of a political situation that did not exist when the old religious unity had been established. A layman, subject to a king, knew exactly what it meant. This meaning was not postponed until after death, but emphasized itself daily in many ways. When once the clergy had become officers of this king, even their loyalty to that king became a matter of less moment, since they became removable by him, and since also the people were not bound to the king through them. The king had no interest in the maintenance of any awesome attitude toward clergy on the part of his lay subjects, since a priest was no longer, from the standpoint of institutional unity, the binding thread which knit Christians together. So that compromise with certain elements of Protestant protestation, impossible for Rome, became immediately possible for England.

The very fact that the Reformation was not a matter of religious zeal predominantly, and that it needed no religious zeal to make it effective, helped it to go slowly. The fact that for long the large majority of laymen had no idea as to where or why it was going also helped. The people were in general shaken loose from Rome in ways which left little of anything altered, and the country might, at Henry's death, have slid back to Roman allegiance even more easily than for a time it seemed about to do under Mary.

Underneath the oscillations of religious policy, extending over a period of some thirty years, the breach with Rome became a settled and, save for a negligible minority, an accepted thing; and an atmosphere of religious uncertainty grew to a point where *uniformity* became more and more desirable to that solid English mass which had refused to rush zealously in either one direction or another during the troubled period. The religious struggle which had been, under Henry particularly, hardly anything save a struggle between king and Church, ended by subduing the ecclesiastical officers under a new master, who was in the end able to give them far more latitude of reform than the pope might have done. There was no place for a new religious prophet but, the question of supremacy once settled, there was such an opportunity for the solid middle mass of clerical opinion and sympathy to effect a reformation, such as had not arisen anywhere else in Europe. And so the English Reformation of the sixteenth century became, not a popular but a clerical reformation; a reformation inspired, not by the prophetic but by the priestly point of view.

There was one disturbing element in this reform, which was the Bible. However the Bible was not at the beginning a very disturbing factor, since the solid mass of reform was disposed to take it as merely a negative test of truth. Whatever practices grown up with the medieval Church had accumulated about them clear abuses might be referred to the Scriptures, and if warrant were not clearly found for them there, they might be rejected as *papist superstitions.* In the positive sense, however, these reformers were not disposed to reject beliefs or practices merely because they could not be shown to have descended from the primitive Christian community. A priestly caste is naturally conservative in religious matters. They live in a world of religious symbolism, to which their thoughts and emotions are attuned by habit. This symbolism is their sphere of activity and influence. In general they can hardly be expected to cut off either their own sacred hands or anointed heads.

For this reason the English reformation of the sixteenth century is hardly to be considered, in intention, a part of the Protestant Reformation. This Reformation elsewhere aimed to destroy theories upon which priestly prerogatives rested, as well as those upon which ecclesiastical prerogatives rested. Whatever power was given back by Protestantism to its professional churchmen was given back, not to priests, but to preachers, who were given this power as preachers and teachers of a religious law. Although Protestantism generally aimed to found itself upon a book, the *Bible,* it was upon quite another book that the Church of England was to be founded; their *Book of Common Prayer.* In general, uniformity of faith was sought, not by defining a faith of general profession, but by so defining a faith as to leave it as much as possible free of precise definition; whereas what was more and more definitely sought was *uniformity of worship.*

Modern study of primitive religion has shown that almost universally ritual is older than doctrine or myth; and that a ritual form can outlast, substantially unchanged, even fundamental changes in myths or doctrines formulated to explain or interpret the ceremony. The first positive steps in religious reform in England happened to have been under the guidance of a man who was not only pliant with respect to many matters of religious doctrine, but also possessed of scholarly interest in ritual, and an extremely fine and delicate sense of literary style as adapted to ritual (Thomas Cranmer). The various religious oscillations removed from influence all important clerics save the conformers. So it came about that, with a surprising lack of disharmony compared with elsewhere, the religious muddle in which the Reformation left Europe generally for nearly a century, was for a time rather peacefully laid to rest. The English mind, which seldom attacks a problem upon the basis of logic or speculative theory, and which more than once has appeared to solve in seeming haphazard manner some intricate or troublesome problem, a certain practical instinct of compromise putting theory to confusion, has seldom acted more effectively.

Such, in final analysis, was the religious reform which began among the tangled political threads of Henry's quarrel about his divorce from Catherine of Aragon. But this by no means left the matter simple. While Parliament passed acts of uniformity in religion, the ritual basis for which clerics were to arrange as best they could, still a third power, the monarchy decided what sorts of religious opinion were to be tolerated or persecuted, and chose the clerics who arranged the ritual basis of uniformity. This was not all: every interval of license given to free expression of radical religious opinion added to the force of such opinion. Such radicalism was later to solidify as the Puritan spirit, of which there were already some zealots. Popularly it was more often a mere revolt against religious authority, which began in determination to oust religious tyranny and pocket-picking, and proceeded toward a general attitude of refusal to be religiously impressed. In such an atmosphere strange enactments might take place. On one occasion, as a movement grew to oust images from churches, it was decreed that all statues or images be removed, save those of kings or princes who had never been reputed saints.

So much of the most modern revolt against religion, in countries where the Puritan temper took root, has become vociferous as reaction against *Puritan morals,* it may become worth someone's time to attempt to discover how much of the Puritan spirit was religious, even when the positive task of ordering society was undertaken by it. As revolt it easily became a great leveler, stridently proclaiming, "God knows I'm as good as any saint that ever was."

Despite difficulties, the task of formulating a ritual and obliging everyone to conform to it in public worship went on with some general steadiness of direction. Indeed to trace the history of the Book of Common Prayer would be in a large measure also to trace the settlement of Anglican doctrine. The first attempt at doctrinal formulation was in 1536. One article only seemed to go in a revolutionary direction; since but three of the traditional seven sacraments were discussed. This neglect, however, was merely an attempt to avoid discussion of the other four, and in a new profession the following year all seven were discussed, without definite rejection of any. Then a division was made between *major* and *minor* sacraments, and penance slipped out by way of the introduction of a general public confession making private auricular confession tacitly no longer required. Five of the traditional seven orders of the clergy were amputated, merely by preparing a new book of forms of ordination ritual, which included no services for the ordination of doorkeepers, lectors, exorcists, acolytes, or subdeacons. The celebration of the eucharist was gradually introduced in English, by allowing for a time *masses* in Latin and *communions* in English.

Indeed such an apparently simple matter as the institution of services in English rather than Latin was by no means as welcome or even acceptable as might be imagined. In parts of England, and generally in Wales, the new language of the services, when an English prayer book was introduced, was no more commonly understood than the old had been, and between two languages, neither of which were understood, people quite humanly preferred the one to which they were accustomed. Nor was this the sole ground of complaint. Elsewhere people complained that the priests read the English prayers with the same tone of voice formerly used in the Latin service, so that even those who understood English could understand what they said but little better than the former Latin. This was thought a matter of little importance, "since those who had been accustomed to read in that voice could not easily alter it; but as these dropped off and died, others would be put in their places, who would officiate in a plainer voice."[2]

---

[2] Burnet, *History of the Reformation,* II, i.

All this difficulty in habituating people to a new language in ritual, despite the fact that the old was a language which they did not understand, emphasizes the wisdom of centering the type of reformation attempted in England upon the preparation of a book of ritual.

Not until 1548, after the death of Henry, was the marriage of the clergy definitely allowed. It was still thought better for "priests and other ministers of the church to live chaste and without marriage," which public opinion left a stigma upon married priests, removed in 1552, by an act which declared that, since some spoke slanderously of married priests, causing the word of God not to be heard with due reverence, the regular marriage of priests was particularly declared good and valid, "as by the law of God . . . any decretal, canon law, ecclesiastical law, or usage to the contrary notwithstanding." [3]

In 1549 there was legislation regarding the tradition of fasting from meat on certain occasions. It was declared that:

> Since due abstinence was a means to virtue, and to subdue men's bodies to their soul and spirit, and was also necessary *to encourage the trade of fishing,* and for saving flesh (meat) . . . it was enacted, that . . . none should eat flesh on Fridays, Saturdays, Ember-days, in Lent, or any other days that should be declared fish days, under several penalties.[4]

In such ways did reformed religion make slow and careful progress. But along with these steps the English Bible was gradually introduced, first as contraband, then publicly, with the command that there be Bibles in Latin and in English in every church. Also, beginning particularly with the reign of Edward VI, English divines were very ready to listen to counsel from Protestant leaders on the Continent, who had undertaken more radical revolutionary measures. Protestants against the English type of Protestantism there were soon to be, and they legitimately earned the soubriquet of Nonconformists. This brand of opinion is said to have been first organized as a sect, among exiles driven from England during the reign of Mary, at Frankfort in Germany, where a breach of unity arose precisely about the question as to whether or not the Service Book of Edward VI should be used by them entire, or with modifications and simplifications. Calvin was called upon to give his advice toward healing the breach, and wrote a letter in which he apologized for meddling with their affairs, and then went on to say that, "in his opinion they were too much addicted to the English Ceremonies; nor could he see to what purpose it was to burden the Church with such hurtful and offensive Things, when there was liberty to have a simple and more pure order." [5] King Edward's Prayer Book had, however, the best of it in the end, among those ejected from the congregation in consequence being John Knox, who was to organize the particular form the Reformation took in Scotland.

---

[3] *Ibid.,* II, i.

[4] *Ibid.,* I, iii.

This small tempest among exiles was more or less repeated when Elizabeth was firmly seated upon her throne. As in Germany, the Nonconformists again had the first round, burning rood-screens, crucifixes, copes, surplices, altar cloths, etc., several places, in vengeance for the papist reign of Mary at its termination. Such conduct was displeasing to Elizabeth, who while consenting at the outset of her reign to see offensive ornaments removed from churches, insisted that she herself would not part with her altar, nor her lighted candles, nor her crucifix, out of her own private chapel.

Elizabeth was politic, and no hand to lose solid advantages by insisting upon things less essential at an inopportune moment. After the reign of Mary people were, those at least of antipapist persuasion, peculiarly sensitive to anything which might smack or remind of it. But dissenters Elizabeth most decidedly did not like, and ornaments she did. Gradually, but steadily, during her reign "Religion and Virtue," as the historian of Puritanism expresses it, "were discountenanced for the sake of their pretended ornaments; the consciences of good men were entangled, and the Reformation exposed to the utmost hazard." [6]

Since a large part of the history of the establishment of the religion of the Reformation in England can be read in the steps in preparing the Book of Common Prayer, and in controversy centering in it, the history of this book is a long and complicated process that cannot here be retraced. In a sense this history begins in the year 1536, with a new edition of the *Breviary* in most common use in England, still in Latin, but with the Roman pontiff's name and a few other things omitted. The history was not complete until 1660, on the restoration of the monarchy of the Stuarts. It is marked by five prayer books; the first of which, however (that of 1549) was preceded by the introduction of several new orders for particular services in the English language.

---

[5] Neal, *History of the Puritans,* I, 108-115, gives extracts of documents of this controversy.

[6] *Ibid.,* 1, 218.

The guiding purpose in the beginning of the preparation of this book is perhaps to be found in the preface set before the First Prayer Book of 1549. There was an intent to discriminate between hallowed ritual of early usage (even into which "abuses" had crept), and other later ceremonies which were themselves grounded in "vanity and superstition," from which bad beginning even greater aberrations had grown.[7] In matters of ritual Scripture could be but a negative guide; as few practices could be condemned as plainly contrary to Scripture. The broad term of anathema was *popery.* A sacrificial theory of the eucharist, or mass, was clear popery; but there were some matters in which distinction was forced to be subtle indeed. Transubstantiation, as an explanation of the presence of Christ in the sacrament was popery, but the corporeal presence without the transubstantiation was disputable. So, as late as the Third Prayer Book, of Elizabeth's time, "it was proposed to have the communion book so contrived as not to exclude the belief of the corporeal presence; for the chief design of the queen's council was to unite the nation in one faith, and the greatest part of the nation continued to believe such a presence. Therefore it was recommended to the divines to see that there should be no express definition made against it; that so it might lie as a speculative opinion, not determined, in which every man was left to the freedom of his own mind." [8]

---

[7] See Preface to *First Prayer Book* of Edward VI, and Burnet, II, 1.
[8] Burnet, II, iii.

But the attempt to enforce uniformity in worship upset this attempt to straddle, because already in the reign of Elizabeth, and of James I, both in England and Scotland, the reception of the elements in this eucharistic, or sacramental, or sacrificial feast, in a kneeling posture, was believed to imply necessarily a belief in that very *corporeal* presence which had been left as speculative and undetermined.

But even less important matters, against which certainly nothing could be found in Scripture, and which in no way clearly implied any *doctrine* of saving import, might be objected to with equal stubbornness and heat—the mere matter, for example, of the wearing of a white surplice by an officiating clergyman. Here doubtless the reign of Catholic Mary, which exiled many zealous Protestants to Geneva and elsewhere in Calvinist territory, played a part, since to the Geneva reformers surplices and many other equally unimportant matters were magnified as the trappings of Satan, for the snaring and delusion of the faithful.

However, it is a mistake to assume that the majority of zealous Protestants were so uncompromising as to be unable to support the sight of a surplice, or even to kneel, more in conformity with authoritative command than as clearly accepting belief in a corporeal presence. Against the hard but crafty determination of Elizabeth, the greater number even of inwardly protesting Nonconformists gave way toward the end of her reign, more ready to conform outwardly and work for reform from within.

Behind any such apparent calm however there remained still important questions unsettled. The return to power and influence of the bishops, under Elizabeth, despite growing protest against their power, was a realization of the fact that the Reformation in England could not stop with the mere substitution of an English monarch for a Roman pope, as head of the Church in England. Calvinism was playing another disintegrating rôle in the British Isles, more important than matters of ceremony or doctrine. Calvinist theology subordinated monarchs to the company of the Elect, who were, on the authority of Scripture, judges and rulers, prophetically inspired to chasten kings and keep them in their place. The divine right of kings was attained. God spake to popular preachers, who as his instruments rebuked kings and his ministers from their pulpits, where and when they dared.

This was not at all the sort of Reformation Henry VIII had planned, and the force of Elizabeth, aided by many solid advantages she brought her realm during her brilliant reign, succeeded in pushing it over into the seventeenth century. Meanwhile, however, it was preparing its arsenal of courage and scriptural weapon across the border in Scotland, where political chaos gave the Puritan preachers, not only much freedom to exercise their influence, but a real task of moral reform, in which, despite narrow and unlovely characteristics they displayed, they rose conspicuous for social order and moral regularity, bullying often a population in which Catholic sympathy was perhaps still predominant among the common people, and even in moments bullying princes.

Let us then, in short résumé, turn to the Reformation in its Scottish form.

The general history of Scotland can be hardly touched upon. Scotland trailed straight through the sixteenth century political conditions in many ways reminding one of Europe generally in the eleventh and twelfth. Save for its cities, social and political forces grouped in *clans* about the feudal leaders of these clans. More than once these feudal lords threatened the life of James VI, just on the eve of becoming James I of England, and still against them he dared take often no very open or decided steps.

In the lawless society of Scotland during the later Middle Ages, the abuses of the Church, arousing everywhere more bitter and persistent criticism, perhaps surpassed those of any other portion of Europe. As one slight indication of the condition among the clergy in the fifteenth century, one cleric, about to receive a chaplaincy, signs a deed of obligation, in which he binds himself, engaging *six sureties* for his keeping the bond, not to pawn the sacred books, plate, or vestments, "to use no unreasonable excess," and "to have no continual concubine."[9] Rome drained a great deal of money out of what was a poor, and has never been noted as a loose-fisted country. Wycliffe's Lollardry had found response in Scotland, and the recrudescence of preaching, which came with the introduction of reform doctrine of the Swiss brand, appears to have particularly appealed to the Scotch, most of whom could not read, but many of whom were undoubtedly, as they remain, fond of argument, and intellectual stimulation, neither of which they had got from their parish priests, most of whom were too ignorant to preach at all, nor from the preaching friars, who lived in a world of legendary saints, marvels, and weird allegorical interpretations.

---

[9] Quoted from Andrew Lang, *History of Scotland,* I, 425.

Moreover the Scotch were great individualists, a temperament which social conditions accentuated, and Protestantism encouraged; and they had no overwhelming desire for law and order, nor for any centralized political power strong enough to gather force from any religion, Catholic or Protestant.

In short, the Reformation in Scotland was to be in almost every way different from that in England, and its rise fell in a period in every way most propitious for the growth of a religious power which was not wielded by a monarch, but by those who were themselves leaders in the Reformation itself. As at Geneva, in short, but here on a far broader and more chaotic scale, the Reformation was to build directly upon decadent feudal chaos, with no intervening shift of power from pope to king, and the elect saints were to enjoy a period of troubled, broken, and yet somewhat effective rule.

The movement centers about John Knox who, having left Geneva, where he had been minister to the English congregation, arrived in Edinburgh in 1559, and settled at Perth, "a sort of evangelist over the whole kingdom." Mary, the titular monarch, was a minor, married to a French prince, and resident in France. The Regent was a Catholic member of the Guise family. Mary's subsequent return for a short period of troubled rule, was fuel to the flame of the reform. Mary made no secret, upon her arrival, of the fact that she was a Catholic and intended to remain so. In Knox's theory, "if kings and princes refused to reform religion, inferior magistrates and the people, being directed and instructed in the truth by their preachers, may lawfully reform within their own bounds themselves; and if all or the far greater part be enlightened, they may make a public reformation." [10]

Poor Mary, with trouble enough to keep her house and heart in order, was lectured and reprimanded publicly from pulpits. Upon the disorders of her reign the power of the *Kirk,* in effect the power of a popular preacher in the community where he ministered, grew. From 1576 the ministers of the Kirk labored at the task of collecting, "out of the Book of God, a form of discipline and policy ecclesiastical"; and then of proposing it to the Ruler, for confirmation "as a law proceeding from God." [11] In theory their attempt put the preachers above all law, and as the final authority, not only in the matter of law, but as to who were to be counted citizens of the realm, since their claim to have the power of excommunication without legal review, amounted practically to making outcasts of the excommunicated.

There is an always present demand upon every sort of religion of salvation for some clear and simple answer to the question, "What shall I do to be saved?" It was the Scottish Kirk that elaborated the answer of Puritanism, erecting *Sabbath-keeping,* as a simple method of gaining heaven at the mere price of consenting to be more or less unnaturally gloomy, constrained, if not actively miserable, during one day in seven. The prescription had, of course, no warrant in Scripture, where a commandment claiming the authority of Moses enjoined merely abstinence from labor. Calvin himself had thought of no such easy formula, allowing himself a harmless game of bowls upon a Sunday afternoon. It served, however, as a way of fitting old ascetic practices, which aimed to check pleasurable bodily functionings every day, into the lives of those who remained citizens of the world rather than of enclosed monasteries or lonely hermitages, and Puritans took to it like ducks to water. The young, still energetic and adventurous, doubtless found it cramping, but with older settled habits,

[10] Neal, *History of Puritanism,* I, 165.
[11] Lang, *History of Scotland,* II, 277.

nothing so well prepared the Elect for the worldly compromises they felt obliged to make, in the furtherance of commercial ends which God favored in causing them to prosper, as a good rigid Sunday of penance.

Sabbath-keeping became the center of the rule of the Kirk which, although of ambiguous legal status, became in many communities the sole maintainer of public and private morals. The injustice was, aside from the tyranny, that the Kirk could touch the morals merely of the modestly placed, and was obliged even to accept silently infractions of those nobles which helped further its power. While middle and lower class adulterers, fornicators, or merely frivolous or profane, might be made objects of public scorn or more serious punishment, the lairds and their ladies, whose morals were by no means above reproach, got off unscathed, unless they became antagonists of the Kirk, and in consequence objects of pulpit criticism.

Despite all this, and in the midst of intrigue which included Elizabeth, Jesuits, Spain, France, not to speak of local feuds and machinations against the life and liberty of the monarch, the rule of the Kirk was largely tolerated, and even upheld in an unsettled legal status until, in 1594, when James VI ended his minority and began to rule in his own name, this rule was given a measure of legal foundation. Presbyteries were given power to keep good order within their parish boundaries. Elders were not merely to see that the word of God was duly preached and the sacraments properly administered, but they were to maintain discipline, an elastic term, and to have power and jurisdiction in their congregation in *matters ecclesiastical,*[12] which, from the standpoint of Calvin's *Institute,* came little short of meaning universal jurisdiction. "The real danger of Protestantism in Scotland . . . arose from the pretensions of the preachers," says one historian.[13] "The absolutism of James was forced upon him in large degree by the Presbyterian clergy," [14] says another.

This was the new menace which came to raise its head above the apparent calm in which the English Reformation had settled down. Against it Elizabeth strengthened the power of bishops, since she appointed bishops and might control them. Against it more stubbornly, and less wisely, James VI, once King of England, set his determination. But, despite the efforts of kings, and aided by the faults of both James I and his son Charles I, Presbyterianism grew in influence in the English House of Commons, and was soon to be used as a weapon against the absolutism of the Stuart rule. But as it soon came to be discovered, "New Presbyter is but old Priest writ large," and when the Reformation resumed it was to be a three-cornered affair eventually, in which the Independents, finding in Oliver Cromwell a leader, held for a critical time the balance of power. The unrest of the Rebellion and the short rule of the Protectorate brought back a desire for order again. The Book of Common Prayer was, as we shall see, to come back with the Restoration, and more determinedly than ever.

---

[12] Neal, *History of Puritanism,* I, 570, gives résumé of act.

[13] Andrew Lang.

[14] Hume-Brown.

> Our general aim [says the Preface to the new Prayer Book which came in with the Restoration and remains the Prayer Book of the Church of England] . . . was not to gratify this or that party . . . but to do that which to our best understanding we conceived might most tend to the preservation of peace and unity in the Church.

Something had meanwhile happened to the consciences of many of the elect, since the bishops and other dignitaries, who determinedly put down Nonconformists at this time, found the House of Commons ready to grant in general what they wished. The Scottish reform was greatly to influence England's history, but the rule of the Kirk was never to settle upon Englishmen, who so far as they allowed a church to rule at all, preferred bishops and their orderly paraphernalia. In this struggle the right of the individual conscience was to arise and become vocal, as we shall see, but the elect were never to arraign themselves clearly upon the side of religious liberty until they had the king where they wanted him, and religion in consequence out of the way as a practical force.

So much for the *Anglican way* of procuring religious harmony, which the formalism and decorum of the eighteenth century, together with that increase in material wealth and ease, with its own reason for preferring decency and order, helped to wear into the comfort of a habit. Churchgoing, along with an attitude "lowly and reverent" toward one's betters, was to become a mark of gentility in high and low; and over all this the Book of Common Prayer presided beautifully. It did more than this. Its oft-repeated prayers embedded themselves in the temper of the people, helping to mold the graciousness and kindliness of England's neighborly and more intimate social intercourse. Harshness, which Puritanism nourished, and which might feed upon a certain reticence that naturally checked the Anglo-Saxon in any temptation to give public and open expression to his gentler feelings, was rubbed smoother. Even the elect, or many of them, learned to get upon their knees at times in church at least, which may in moments have affected them.

Something more, and very far-reaching was also accomplished by this book. Its phrases wove themselves into the language, during a period when the English language as we know it to-day was being formed and polished. It has been said that the authorized translation of the Bible, dating from the beginning of the seventeenth century, together with the Book of Common Prayer, have influenced more than any other literary work, Shakespeare's included, the diction and phrasing of the English language.

# BOOK VIII

# THE INTRENCHMENT OF ROMAN CATHOLICISM

# XLIX

> Man was created to praise, honor, and serve God . . . and by this means save his soul. All other earthly things were created for man, and to aid him in pursuing the end marked for him by God in his creation. It therefore follows that we should use such things so far as they serve this end . . . [otherwise] indifferent to all created objects . . . in such way that, for our part, we no longer prefer health to sickness, riches to poverty, honor to disdain, long life rather than short . . . desiring and choosing only what more surely conduces toward the end for which we are created.[1]
>
> We should always be disposed to believe that what appears to us white is black, if the hierarchy of the Church so decides. For it must always be believed that . . . one single spirit governs and directs us, for the salvation of our souls, and that it is by that same spirit, which gave the ten commandments, that our Mother, the holy Church, is directed and governed.[2]

It may, on superficial reading, appear that here, after all the turmoil and disorder we have followed, the medieval Church speaks again with authority and certainty. There are, however, nuances of difference that appear upon closer examination, in which lie concealed the reaction of the Roman Church to a division of Christendom which it was powerless to heal. That man's central purpose was the saving of his soul, and that all other things were created for him, to aid in this process, the Middle Ages might have said. But there is in the above-quoted passage an emphasis upon the rest of creation as an *instrumentality* which is new. So far as material things were a collection of means to an end, the medieval period largely considered them naïvely, with respect to man's obvious material needs. When it was a matter of salvation, the medieval point of view laid the instrumentality of these things aside, in this sense *other-worldly* in theory. Materially speaking, man did not win salvation *in* living in the world, but rather *while* obliged to live in it. The instrumentality of things fought against, rather than for, salvation; for the gaining which the material universe *signified* rather than assisted, as emphasized above in several places. It was the Renaissance that urged men again to consider the instrumentality of material things in a broadening sphere, and the Renaissance, or the best part of its enthusiasm, stands between the Middle Ages and the writing of the words quoted above.

---

[1] *Exercices Spirituels* of Ignatius Loyola (trans. from the Spanish text by Father Pierre Jennesseaux, into French, from which this translation is made), *Première Semaine, Principe et Fondement.*

[2] *Ibid.* From appended section entitled, "De la Soumission à l'Église."

As to the second quoted passage, the thought of the Middle Ages, while building up and confident, ever insisted that Christian faith was reasonable. It could hardly have used Plato and Aristotle, inspirers of its method and logic, otherwise. The senses erred, to be sure, but errors of the senses were regarded in the realm of the senses, as sensualities. Intellectually, one looked at things to learn, not to deny what one perceived. Physics shaded into theology, and the principle that what was false in philosophy might be true in theology, and vice versa, was contested by Scholasticism, and usually laid to the charge of heresy. Divine ideas were half-hidden in material things, which divine ideas it was the task of philosophy to discover in them, and if one saw white black, and black white, the whole medieval synthesis was topsy-turvy.

But now the whole world upon which the Christian Church had for centuries attempted to build itself, and which had built up around it, was topsy-turvy. It was no longer possible even to attempt to reconcile reasonably everything with the organized faith. Reasoning had worked, was working still, to destroy that faith. Reasoning had worked to build new religious institutions in a Protestant portion of Europe, and soon seemed to many good Catholics to be there at work destroying the very Protestantism which it had attempted to set up. And so, for those whose interest centered in saving the traditional church, reasoning needed a new sort of discipline. It was now necessary to keep alive, in a current of change, a single vision, cleaving or turning back again upon the center from which it parted every tendency to wander off, after some forbidden emotion, reflection, or even any dangerous sense perception, however fortified by methodical scientific investigation and test. And this new sort of discipline was one of the will, in governing, not its sensual and emotional machinery primarily, but its temptations, in reflection, to wander in unorganized ways now opening up.

Medieval religion had aimed to live by keeping alive a vision. It had been the particular task of monasticism to keep alive this vision. It had become the exercise of philosophy to organize and define this vision in terms of its own dialectic. Now, what monasticism had in a measure, among dissolving institutions, midst a barbarian world, accomplished, must again be attempted, but in quite another sort of world, and with a different technique.

The monastic pattern had built in solitude. In the early centuries of Western monasticism too a world was topsy-turvy, and separated monasteries, according to the ideal of Benedict, were tiny islands, upon which more or less isolated experiments were performed, among social conditions of the simplest sort. Then, indeed, the world was not only topsy-turvy, but seemed to have fallen to pieces literally. But now what had fallen to pieces was less the world, than that vision monasticism had bred and cherished, which Scholasticism had clarified and defined; which vision, as it was bred, and as it had been clarified and defined, had been run as a binding thread through all the world now topsy-turvy again. And because this thread was now everywhere interwoven, the problem of preserving it unbroken was no longer a problem to be solved in solitude. The task was rather that of hardening a crystal shell about this thread, that it might still run everywhere through this world, only more resistant, both seen and seeing, but untouched, unaltered, unmoved.

An impossible task perhaps; a very troublesome one certainly; and yet one which the new situation naturally tempted. For, while we have spoken of this vision as a thread, it was also one other thing—the eye of faith which perceived the thread. For centuries this eye of faith had looked out into the world to trace easily, naïvely, this thread, finding its own reënforcement in form, in symbol, in social and political institutions, in almost unquestioned intellectual conceptions. But now these forms, symbols, and institutions had been jostled, and these conceptions were openly and boldly questioned. The eye of faith must look out upon a world less friendly to its vision. It could more easily lose sight of the external thread which fortified it. The basis of conviction must rest more completely in the eye itself, in the *psyche* of the faithful. And this psyche must be disciplined to search out and follow this thread; to transmute, ignore, even deny, if necessary, unfriendly perceptions. Best of all, perhaps, it might learn to keep, along with a natural world, and a natural life, to the necessary conditions of which it became pliant where it might, a *supernatural world,* and a *supernatural life,* intrinsically untouched by all that jostled it; to which supernatural world appropriate reactions of the *psyche* were, so far as possible, unalterably adjusted.

Doubtless none saw this problem at the beginning so clearly as we have attempted to define it. The defensive armor, either of church institution or of believer's *psyche,* was not in a moment donned. Ecclesiastical authority had never been so practically effective as universal assent in theory made it. The Church had never thundered claims effectively, without at the same time thundering them wisely and prudently. And so the note of confidence might shade subtly into the note of self-defense. None could put their finger upon a moment when the accent changed. But perhaps no man saw so clearly, and certainly none so clearly pointed the future path of Catholicism, as now but a part of Christendom, and followed it with such uncompromising logic as the one to whom is mainly due the little manual of pious devotion and discipline from which the above words are quoted.

The currents of the Catholic movement known to historians as the Counter Reformation were by no means all concentrated around the methods and purpose of the Jesuit Company, but there was little of the consistent logic of the movement which this company did not comprehend and serve, and we can in no better way get an initial understanding of the revolution worked within the Roman Catholic Church, when it found itself facing a breach in the religious unity of Christendom which it was powerless to heal, than by turning for some moments our attention to Ignatius Loyola, and the *Company of Jesus* which he founded.

> Easy life, enjoyment, and repose were invented for soft courtiers, but toil, unrest, and arms were invented and made for those alone whom the world calls knight-errants, of whom I, though unworthy, am the least of all.[3]

Cervantes, who put these words into the mouth of his half-mad hero, was born fifty-four years after Loyola. Approximately the same number of years before Loyola's birth another Spanish author wrote, in somewhat different spirit, the biography of an actual person, in a frame of chivalric ideal.

This author tells us that God has three "orders of chivalry": the angels who fought for him against Lucifer, the martyrs who died "for the holy Catholic faith," and the "good kings of the earth . . . and the good knights who devote themselves to the defense and protection of our mother, the holy Church, and the holy Catholic faith, and the honor of their king and kingdom." He also says that there are two ways of conquering God's enemies, one with sword in earthly battle, in which "the killed is judged vanquished, and the killer is called conqueror."

> Of other sort is the battle waged for Jesus Christ. He who engages in this battle has no visible nor corporeal arms; but he has for his standard the cross of Jesus Christ, as shield the Catholic faith, and in his heart and on his lips the holy law of Jesus Christ, that is to say the Gospel. With these arms he strikes and kills his enemies. Those who remain thus firm in the faith even unto death, and, never allowing themselves to turn aside from the good purpose, suffer tortures even to death rather than consent to false declarations, or to the false opinions of unbelievers and heretics, such are called conquerers, because, in succumbing to the first death, they have conquered that of Hell.[4]

These quotations, both of them, are appropriate in connection with the career of Ignatius Loyola who, brought up and educated as noble and knightly soldier under the tradition of Spanish chivalry, changed his order of chivalry in his thirtieth year, while continuing, even within the inclosure of his Roman palace as general of his order, an astute knight-errantry, of imaginative bounds broader than those of Don Quixote, and of discipline far more exacting. If Don Quixote's hallucinations led to ridiculous attacks on windmills, the visions of Loyola were transmuted into policies and tactics of clearest realism, pursued with cool and far-seeing intelligence: a knight-errant of courage and fortitude certainly, but of the Renaissance and not the Middle Ages, who believed that he who followed intelligent purposes, with firmness unbending, might mold kingdoms and principalities to suit his erstwhile visionary aims.

---

[3] Cervantes, *Don Quixote,* chap. xiii.

[4] *Le Victorial* (trans. from manuscript into French, by the Counts Circourt and Puymaigre, Paris, 1867), 53.

Important crises often melt the substantial material of strong but nervously impressionable personalities, remolding them, while at the same time tempering them to steel. So it happened with Ignatius Loyola. A soldier, a brave soldier, who had already shown ability in handling men in diplomatic mission, with such a life of gayety, gambling and love adventure behind him as little distinguished him from other gallant officers of noble birth, he was wounded and captured in defending the capital of Navarre against French attack (1521).

The French treated their captive well. One of his legs was shattered, the other also wounded. Setting and bandaging the shattered leg, after two weeks they sent him to his home in a litter. The leg was badly set, and in order to avoid amputation it was necessary to rebreak it. With fist clenched and no cry of pain Loyola stood the painful operation. This was not all; after this operation it appeared that a bone stuck out below the knee in an ugly manner. Ignatius insisted that the offending bone be cut away, despite warning that this would be extremely painful. He was still not out of trouble, for it then appeared that one thigh had become shorter than the other, so that he must henceforth limp. He then had himself stretched upon a rack, in an attempt to pull it to equal length with the other of the pair. This operation, however, did not entirely succeed, so that he was henceforth destined to limp, though we are told that he learned to conceal this deformity, almost completely.[5]

"In Spain," writes the distinguished American historian of the Spanish Inquisition, "the business of the Castilian was war. The arts of peace were left with disdain to the Jews and the conquered Moslems." [6] And in war, the earlier writer just quoted writes, there are three sorts of persons of whom one takes no counsel: women, clerics, and sick people, even though the invalid "had formerly been an efficient knight." Monks and clerks "have not the stomach to support fatigue. They are good only for eating, sleeping, and living peacefully. They are timorous and unable to inspire bravery in others. As for invalids, however good they may have been before, they become so occupied with their trouble and the pain that upsets them and takes away their courage, pleasure, and joy, they think of nothing save the illness with which they suffer." [7]

Cut off from a Spanish gentleman's vocation, Loyola may have meditated upon such disheartening aspects of a cripple's fate, as he lay upon his sick bed. Of the renounced elements of the spiritual combat of these weeks we are, however, told little definitely. "He was in love with a lady of the royal court; he conquered this love. He had for the career of arms such liking as evidence the great soldiers; he trampled at his feet ambitions of military glory." [8] Put to bed a soldier, he rose from it a Christian who, "in the transports of his love, could and would engage in gigantic undertakings, for in this period man did not measure his strength by standards of human weakness." [9]

Rising from his bed with a new plan of life before him, he slipped secretly from his paternal home, set out for a shrine of pilgrimage where there was a miracle-working image of the Virgin, registered a vow of chastity while en route, and then, like Amadis of Gaul, or Don Quixote, having constituted himself a knight of Jesus and Mary, he passed the night before the altar of the Virgin in a little church, hung his sword upon a pillar there the morning following, gave away his rich clothing, put on sackcloth, and approached a little village on the Feast of the Assumption. In his chamber in the little hospice of this village he kept vigil, fighting devils without, and the internal devils of bodily desire. Removing to a cave near-by his self-punishment became more strenuous. For a week he was in a trance, experiencing visions, later written down, but destroyed by him before his death.

---

[5] Crétineau-Joly, *Histoire Religieuse, Politique et Litéraire de la Compagnie de Jesus,* I, 14-15, 54.

[6] Lea, *A History of the Inquisition in Spain,* I, 2.

[7] *Le Victorial,* 233-234. [8] Cretineau-Joly, I, 16. [9] *Ibid.,* I, 14.

> Enraptured in contemplating the dignity of the Lord Christ and his unbelievable love for humankind . . . he figured to himself the Christ as a general fighting the enemies of the divine glory, and calling to all men to enroll under his banner. From this took birth the desire to form an army, of which Jesus would be chief and emperor.[10]

These things happened during the year 1522, and may have accumulated elements of myth.[11] Twelve years followed, much of the time devoted to study since, as a soldier, his literary education was more than modest. Finally, in Paris, in 1534, the Feast of the Assumption, a little company of seven got together and took vows of poverty and chastity, adding the obligation to go either to the Holy Land or to Rome. Meanwhile he incurred the enmity of a cardinal (later to become Pope Paul IV), and was under suspicion of the Inquisition. In 1537 Loyola was made a priest. The plan of going to the Holy Land proved impracticable, and with two companions he set off for Rome. On the road, as he himself reports, he had a vision. God the Father placed him so clearly with Christ in this vision that he could not himself doubt that it had been God who had so placed him.

In Rome something like corporate work began. A Rule was drawn up, the name, *Company of Jesus,* adopted. But there were enemies, and caution was necessary. Ignatius noted, in entering

---

[10] Cretineau-Joly, quoting from the manuscript of Father Jouvency.

[11] Loyola says nothing of the cave, nor of the eight days of trance, though he tells of other visions.

Rome, that the windows were closed against him, took it as a sign, and advised his companions, "We must not make the acquaintance of women, unless they be of very high rank."

Loyola and his two companions soon found work to do in Rome. The former founded several institutions to aid the unfortunate and organized religious instruction among the young. One of his companions was appointed by the pope to teach Holy Scripture, the other scholastic theology. Loyola was elected unanimously first general of the order, and, seldom departing from the four walls of his dwelling, settled down to the task of directing its growth, drawing up its *Constitution,* and completing his *Spiritual Exercises.*

In 1556, having been fifteen years general of the order he founded, Loyola died, rather suddenly, and without receiving or requesting the last sacraments. His successor as head of the order was an accomplished theologian and an astute politician, ripened in intrigue by his experience in the Council of Trent. Under him the *Constitutions* of the order were completed, and he set in upon a path of aspiration more extensive than that of Ignatius himself.

Ignatius Loyola has been described above as a knight-errant in the spirit of the Renaissance. Twenty years elapsed between his conversion and his election as general of the Company of Jesus. During this period he was many places, including a short, and disappointing, stay in Jerusalem as a pilgrim, during which he was refused permission to remain. His conception of the religious army he wished to establish was evidently slow in forming. But during all this period, and even afterwards, he was elaborating and perfecting those spiritual exercises which were to mold the warrior of the type of which he dreamed.

The idea of such spiritual exercises, for the purpose of assisting and stimulating moral regeneration by directed meditation, was not original to Loyola. In the early period of his conversion he came upon such a book, written some twenty years previously by a Spanish monk. A far earlier series is ascribed to Bonaventure, who also himself wrote down voluminous meditations of his own.

> If you wish to keep yourself virtuous, you must have spiritual exercises to occupy your mind. Otherwise you will not know how to assure your perseverance.[12]

> I shall ask of myself what I am, and what is my origin, that, through knowledge of myself I may arrive at knowledge of God.[13]

The subjects of meditation, the prescriptions for prayer and pious action which lie between these two quoted passages are simple enough, and there is absolutely no technique of confessional inquisition.

The title even of Loyola's *Exercises* betrays a somewhat different purpose: "Spiritual Exercises, to conquer oneself and so rule one's life as to be determined by no disordered affection." [14] The first element of strikingly revolutionary import, however, is the introduction of a spiritual director. The very first paragraph speaks of "those who give and those who receive the exercises." Into the hand of this director is put a technique, with the more precise suggestions as to procedure, of such a combined fixation of idea and intricate self-examination as to be, in no greatly exaggerated sense, a precursor of the methods of psychoanalysis, and we cannot be far afield in concluding that the successful working of the suggested technique depended largely upon the ability of the director to set himself in somewhat the same relation to his spiritual pupil, as is believed desirable to insure the therapeutic success of the psychoanalytic technique.

At all events the method of the *Exercises* becomes clear upon careful examination. It is that of breaking up, under minute self-examination, by bringing them into consciousness under the supervision of another person trained to suggest and direct the inquisition, habitual modes of feeling, thought, and action; and to establish in their place, while the self-confidence of the patient is thus reduced to a trembling pat of jelly, new and definite patterns, the authority of which is taken to be absolute, subvicariously represented by the director, who may be taken to represent such more august vicars as the general of the Jesuits and the pope.[15]

---

[12] Bonaventura, *Exercises Spirituels,* II, *Oeuvres Spirituelles,* traduit par M. L'Abbé Berthaumier.

[13] *Ibid.,* par. xiii.

[14] Loyola, *Exercices Spirituels.*

Despite the evidence of long and minute study and labor evidenced in the *Exercises* themselves, and testified to by the long period during which Loyola worked upon them, it is doubtful that he ever fully understood their effect. He was, however, a soldier. He knew what a commander felt to be necessary in the way of obedience from those under him; and also, in an attempt of undoubted sincerity to make himself an unquestionably obedient servant of Christ the general of the Christian army, the psychology of obedience was no stranger to his consciousness. With all the intensity and intelligence of a practical genius, turned by circumstances inward to wrench and remold his own motivation, he set forth the method of making knight-errants, whose errantry should no longer spring from their own emotions and imaginations, in the fashion of those of Malory's *Morte d'Arthur;* but who should wander from city to city, state to state, peasant's cottage to palace, in unquestioned obedience to a superior. And this they were to do, not under the compulsion of force, payment, glory, or any other temporal reward or fear, but because they had been remolded in such a way that only in this obedience could they longer be themselves.

That these exercises succeeded always to this ideal extent is quite another question. None the less, as we shall see in reviewing the *Constitutions* drawn up to bind together the converts of Loyola's *Exercises* as an army under the banner of Christ, nothing less than a considerable measure of success could have made effective soldiers in that army, and insured it permanent stability.

Loyola's idea for his community was a new departure among Christian monastic institutions. Comparing the nature of authority he aimed to set up with the authority of the *abbot* under the rule of Benedict, we note first that, while Benedict's abbot was given sole authority, it was for the fatherly purpose of saving the souls of his monastic children. Loyola's idea of centralized power was something quite different, having as its purpose the making of serviceable agents, in the working out of ends in which the salvation of the agent was incidental rather than central. He told his secretary that, in choosing his followers, "he looked less to purely natural goodness than to firmness of character and ability for business, for he was of the opinion that those who were not fit for public business were not adapted for filling offices in the Company."

---

[15] The author knows of no careful study of these exercises in the light of the psychoanalytical technique, but it is evident that such a study would be of considerable value, both as assisting the understanding of the influence of these exercises, and enlightening also the possible influences of the more recent technique.

Looking at the matter of authority from the angle of obedience and submission, here again the purpose is equally different. For Benedict obedience was part of the discipline of *conversion;* its purpose was the salvation of the obedient monk. For Loyola the salvation of the obedient soldier was again incidental, its central purpose being that of putting all the powers of the agent at the disposal of his commander. He stated that even exceptional qualities and gifts were only valuable in his eyes, on condition that they be displayed or reserved on command of a superior.

The Benedictine community was conceived as a household, the Franciscan as a brotherhood, the Jesuit, from its foundation, as an army. He who sought membership proposed "to bear arms for God, under the standard of the Cross, and serve the sole Master (Christ) and the Roman Pontiff, his vicar upon earth." Such service is "a road which leads to (God)," which each should follow "according to the measure of grace accorded him by the Holy Spirit, and the proper degree of his vocation," which latter the General shall decide for him, as well as his employment.[16]

In the petition presented for approval to the pope, the earliest written sketch of the Company's purposes, no details are given, whether or not they had yet been formulated, as to the organization of this centralized power. The members propose merely, in general and by special vow, to accept any employment, anywhere in the world, as apportioned them by the pope, abandoning themselves completely "to the will of God, of the Pope as his vicar,

[16] From the papal bull of institution, quoted from Cretineau-Joly, I, 46ff.

and the General." [17] As the society grew, in numbers and scope of activity, and when eighteen years later the publication of their constitution made known the character of this organized power, and the fact that the general, like the pope himself, was elected for life, Paul IV perhaps suspected that the general would likely have more effective control of the obedience of this company than he himself, and a modification, again later ignored, limiting the general's elected term to three years, was forced upon the society.

It might be said that, in the finished *Constitutions,* nothing was forgotten to insure the proper sort of spirits, among the officers at least. None who had belonged to another order might become a Jesuit. Before ten years of profession none could arrive to a degree which made him of influence on the working of the order. From fifteen to eighteen years of profession was necessary before it was possible to enter within the inner circle. Having once entered this circle, none might seek any preferment of ecclesiastical nature, nor even be clothed with such preferment, unless constrained to accept by the pope, under pain of mortal sin. On command of the general he was, of course, obliged to accept any office offered him.

The government of the society was divided into provinces, the heads of which were appointed, and removable, by the general. For the most part, as a matter of policy, in order that the professed Jesuit should have no strong ties other than his company, officers particularly were seldom allowed to serve in the country of their birth. The Jesuit was to have no home, was to be a mobile and cosmopolitan instrument.

Finally, he was not professed to live a contemplative life, in withdrawal from the secular world. Everything was done to make his intercourse with the world easy and natural. He was not to be tied in proximity to an altar or chapel, but might recite the usual *offices* of prayer, not gathered in a company in the choir, but privately, wherever he chanced to be. He was not so to dress as to emphasize, in monastic fashion, a separation from the rest of men.

The separate soldiers, errant under orders, were to be, not only hands but eyes for the general. It was not only the right of every Jesuit, but a duty enjoined upon him, to communicate directly with the general, and to inform him in any matter which he believed it for the good of the society that the commanding head should know. Living permanently in Rome, "the black pope" as he soon came to be known, knew the comings and goings of every servant of the order, knew doubtless often many of their thoughts as well, even though betrayed most discreetly.

---

[17] *Bull of Institution.*

At the beginning of its existence the Company of Jesus met with the experience, common to almost every rising religious order, of being accused of heresy. Its influence, as early as the Council of Trent, awakened natural jealousy among other orders. The very nature of its organization made it redoubtable and subject of suspicion. Added to this, its very purpose was too practical, and subject to change in the face of practical exigency, not to have led it into many temptations. It is hardly necessary here to enter into the controversy as to whether the principle that the end justifies the means was given official sanction by the society. All instructions finally led up to the general, who, after the pope (who need not always to be sure be called upon in delicate matters) was God's vicar on earth. God's ways are past understanding and finding out!

This much, however, is hardly controversial, that the Company of Jesus lent the pope and Catholic Church, in its campaign to check the institutional ravages of the Reformation, its most effective tool. Throughout the age of exploration its missionaries, most often in the beginning at least with heroic piety, took the Church into new parts of the world where European banners were being floated under strange skies. We shall find them also at home, in Europe, active everywhere. They were in catechetical classes, colleges and universities; in huts and hospitals and royal courts. They trained princes from their youth up, administered spiritual exercises, and heard confessions of crowned heads, of their advisers and of their favorites of more or less legitimacy. They were light cavalry and scouts. Deeper than this they possessed the secret of Roman Catholicism's future. From the moment of the Reformation's definite success in breaking up the institutional unity of Christian religion, Roman Catholicism was to become an *attitude of mind.* In a broadly conceived educational program, far less rigid than what had preceded, though with fewer chinks and holes, they set about to form minds pliant in many directions, but fixed in contemplation of a definite substructure upon which might rest the security of a doctrinal system, now given the definite task of preserving a religious institution of hallowed and century-long prestige.

It is, in the beginning of that task, that we are to meet them in the Council of Trent.

# L

THE enthusiasm of two Renaissance popes for art and magnificence, inspiring the construction of the basilica of St. Peter, at Rome, had led to the sale of indulgences to raise money for its building and adornment; and to that particular sale of indulgences which had precipitated the Reformation in Germany. Thus the immediate incitement of the Reformation had built the architectural symbol of the new Catholic Church and papacy. Another pope, still of the Renaissance tradition, who owed his initial advancement at the Curia to the liaison of his sister with the Borgian pope, Alexander VI, was destined to assemble the council which, with the fire of this conflagration, was to fuse and weld the doctrinal and administrative structure of this same Catholic Church and its papal government: the Council of Trent.

Paolo Sarpi, despite bitter antipapal prejudice the most brilliant historian of this council, describes it as having been sought for and solicited by some, arrested and retarded by others, during a period of twenty-three years, and then, repeatedly dissolved and reconvened during another period of eighteen years, attaining a final success quite other than that hoped for by those who had forwarded, or that feared by those who set obstacles in its way.[1]

The earlier attempts to convene a general council, for the settlement of the Lutheran difficulties and general reform of the Church, have been noted. When Alessandro Farnese ascended the papal chair as Paul III in 1534 the religious and political situation was if anything more complicated than before. The two most powerful sovereigns of Europe, Francis I, King of France, and Charles V, Emperor and head of the house of Hapsburg, with possessions and feudal claims scattered from Hungary to the eastern coasts of Spain, from the south of Italy to the shores of the English Channel, were locked in struggle embittered by personal hatred. Francis had allied himself with Turkish infidels, Charles was to ally himself for a time with a schismatic king, Henry VIII of England. Repeated efforts of the pope were thus unable to reconcile the two most Catholic monarchs of Europe.

---

[1] Fra Paolo Sarpi, *Histoire du Concile de Trente* (trans, from the Italian by Couraver), book i, sec. i.

Zeal for religious reform had been seated even upon the papal throne for a brief period at the very beginning of the Lutheran difficulties, in the person of that same non-Italian pope, Adrian VI, whom already we have had occasion to mention. The most famous preacher in Italy had addressed to Adrian a memoir on the abuses of the time, and the pope, who knew practically nothing of the conditions with which his office was surrounded, and was little either known or liked by the Roman cardinals, was zealous to reform everything, and succeeded, during his twenty months as pope, in curing nothing. "He floundered vainly in the midst of an inextricable labyrinth," comments an Italian historian.[2] His successor was Giulio, Cardinal Medici, whose political career, as Clement VII, begun with a quarrel with the Roman family of Colonna, mixed with the struggle between the Emperor and Francis I, troubled by the divorce of Henry VIII, witnessing the sacking of Rome, undergoing imprisonment, finally dying hated at the papal court, and suspected by the princes,[3] was so full of other things that one hardly might ask of him attempts to reform the religious evils under discussion in many parts of Christendom.

More than once, during his pontificate, Clement VII heard demands for a general council. It might be, instead of a demand that the pope call one, a threat or an attempt of some ruler or rulers to organize one. This possibility was discussed during his short period of captivity. The political world was now quadrilateral, the Emperor, the leagued Protestant princes, the King of France, the King of England, its four corners. All four were involved in religious difficulties. It looked decidedly as if something must be done about religious reform, but unfortunately no one thing could have been done which would have pleased all four of these angles.

---

[2] Cantu, *op. cit.,* II, 69.

[3] "Mori odioso alle corte, sospetto ai principi, e con fama piu presto grave ed odiosa, che piacevole," writes Guicciardini, book xx, cap. ii.

So, had Paul III, when he mounted the papal throne, been a man of strong and vigorous conviction, himself committed to the tide of reform which was rising everywhere higher, his problem would have been sufficiently difficult. As it was, he assumed the tiara at the age of sixty-six, a man whom Alexander VI, the most profligate of popes, had made a cardinal at the age of twenty-six, whose tastes had been formed by paganizing humanism, and whose instincts and ambitions were personally of the character of the princes of the Italian Renaissance. Though shrewd, clever, and of long experience in public affairs, the spirit of reform was rather forced upon him than the expression of his own enthusiasms. Although not less generous in forwarding the interests of his relatives than other Renaissance popes had been, he made some excellent appointments to the college of cardinals, authorized the Jesuit Society, instituted the *Index* of forbidden books, and published numerous bulls for the correction of abuses in the Church. The calling of a general council, however, was quite another and more perilous matter, difficult at best because of the raging differences among the secular princes. Everything in fact assisted him to postpone and procrastinate in the calling of one, and something was almost sure to happen making it appear hopeless to one who had himself no great reason to welcome an assembly which, once in session, he was by no means certain of being able to control. It is therefore not entirely strange that, although he addressed a letter to the nations of Europe in 1536, promising a general council, it was not convened until more than six years later, almost immediately to be adjourned, and to open for its first serious session only in 1545.

Even after these delays the council was to be slow in getting under way. Before the middle of March the papal legates were in Trent,[4] the pope on account of his age and the fatigues of such a journey, did not feel able to support the rigorous climate of the

---

[4] Sarpi, *Histoire du Concile de Trente,* II, vi. Two only of the three papal legates had arrived.

Alpine foothills, and remained in Rome, ready to go in case of urgent necessity.[5] Ten days later the ambassador of the emperor arrived, to be received by the legates, the cardinal-bishop of Trent, and the only three bishops who had as yet put in appearance.[6] The twentieth of April there were but ten bishops present.[7] The pope then set May 3 for the opening. It passed with the discussion of some questions of precedence.[8] By the end of May there were twenty bishops and a few other prelates.[9] Early in June some preliminaries were gotten under way, and some more bishops and a few theologians began to arrive.[10]

Meanwhile the imperial diet was in session at Worms, rife with religious discussion. Protestant princes wanted the council transferred to German soil, and Charles, not unwilling to have it under his wing so requested the pope, who replied, threatening to transfer it to Bologna or Rome.[11] Having previously requested the Pope to delay the opening of the council until the termination of the Diet of Worms, when this diet adjourned Charles requested that the council be opened as quickly as possible, adding that religious discussion in the Diet had not been seriously intended by him, but purposed only to deceive the Protestants until the arrival of the moment opportune to crush them.[12]

Finally, the thirteenth of December, eight months after the arrival of the papal legates, the council opened, the number present still meager enough (hardly thirty-five prelates, substantially two-thirds Italians), with formal procession in full regalia, from the Church of the Trinity to the Cathedral.[13] Germany and Italy awaited impatiently the first printed news of a church council in the world's history.[14] The opening of the council was, however, but "the trumpet to awake the bishops, most of them still in their dioceses, the princes, all of them indifferent to what was happening in Trent, and . . . the sovereign Pontiff himself, who sent no instructions." [15] The legates were determined that this council should not, like the Council of Constance, immediately turning around to demand the abdication of its presiding pope, slip its papal leading strings, allowed no definite action without precise instructions from Rome, and as a witty Frenchman remarked, when communication with Rome was cut off the Holy Ghost postponed his descent upon the sittings of the assembly.

---

[5] Pallavicini, *Histoire du Concile de Trente,* V, viii, 1. The Pallivicini History was written by Sforza Pallavicini of the Company of Jesus as a refutation and counterblast to Sarpi's *History.*

[6] Sarpi, II, vii.

[7] Pallavicini, V, xi, 4.

[8] Sarpi, II, xv.

[9] Sarpi, II, xx.

[10] Pallavicini, V, xiii, 2.

[11] According to Pallavicini "the Pope lost hope of realizing his project concerning translation" which he desired (V, xv, 2). Legates had apparently his authority to transfer it, however, in an emergency.

[12] *Cambridge Modern History,* II, 662. Hinted in Pallavicini, V, xv, 1, that the legates knew more of Charles' intentions than they made public.

[13] Pallavicini, V, xvii, 9; Sarpi, II, xxvii.

Almost the first question decided was that members were not, as in the Council of Constance, to sit by nations but as individuals, although when the Abbey of Monte Cassino sent three abbots, they were finally allowed but a single vote among them.[16] The Italians were none the less safely in the majority, since it was soon decided that the papal instructions to allow German bishops to send proxies savored of favoritism,[17] and in general the Legates refused to accept any procurations, whereas Italian bishops were assisted to defray the expenses of attendance by the papal purse.[18]

Charles had wished the council to discuss first the matter of ecclesiastical abuses. The Pope gave orders to begin with the matters of doctrine, leaving to him meanwhile the question of reform,[19] but some delegates did not forget how the councils of Constance and Pisa had been the dupe of such promises, the pontiffs; "after having settled matters of doctrine dissolved the councils and neglected themselves the reforms." [20] It was decided that matters of doctrine and questions of ecclesiastical reform were to be considered simultaneously. For discussion the assembly was divided into three groups, to meet respectively at the residences of the three papal legates. In this way, the Legates urged publicly and with success, more business could be accomplished with less confusion. *Au fond de leur cœur* lurked other advantages. Smaller groups could be more easily controlled, and factions were weakened by dividing their members among the three groups.[21]

---

[14] Sarpi, II, xxvii.
[15] Pallavicini, VI, i, 1.
[16] Pallavicini, VI, ii, 3.
[17] Pallavicini, VI, ii, 5-7.
[18] C. T. Mirbt, in *Encyclopædia Britannica,* art., "Council of Trent."
[19] Pallavicini, VI, vii, 3-4.
[20] Pallavicini, VI, vii, 6.

Almost immediately came the question made pressing by Lutheran criticism of non-Biblical tradition, and the appeal to scriptural authority. Some theologians, "dared to say that all Catholic doctrine was founded on nothing but tradition, because even the Scriptures were only believed because of traditional foundation." A theologian of the Franciscans quoted Augustine to prove that the Scriptures owed their authority to the Church. "They were not all agreed as to the manner of treating this subject." [22] It appears to have narrowed down to the question as to which of the books of the Bible, since even some of the Fathers had questioned some, were to be accepted. "In the first general congregation nothing was decided" on this question, in the second the diversity and confusion was such in discussion that the matter was put to written vote, and all the books were accepted.[23] This was by far the simplest solution, leaving only the matter of requesting the pope to have a new edition of the Vulgate version prepared, which would settle the textual difficulties, and the fixing of "invariable rules" for the interpretation of this text.[24]

The question of *traditions* without Biblical authority was naturally linked, by Protestant heresy if nothing else, with that of rendering innocuous the reading of the Bible. Next to Biblical authority was that termed *apostolic,* but some beliefs and practices of hallowed memory could scarcely lay claim to direct apostolic rootage. After some four months of session the council, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, three papal legates presiding, decreed its acceptation of all the books of the Bible:

> As well the Old Testament as the New, since the same God is author both of the one and the other; also the traditions, whether regarding

---

[21] Pallavicini, VI, viii, 5.

[22] Sarpi, II, xliv, xlv.

[23] Pallavicini, VI, xi, 8.

[24] Pallavicini, VI, xii, 3.

faith or practices, as dictated by the very mouth of Jesus Christ, or by the Holy Spirit, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession; embracing them with equal respect and with an equal piety.[25]

The question of *original sin,* raised in Luther's doctrines, was the next important theological subject of discussion. Into this the Franciscans and Dominicans attempted to precipitate their difference of opinion as to the immaculate conception of the Virgin, which attempt was however promptly snubbed by the presiding papal legate.[26] But there were many other subtle opinions more directly concerned with the general doctrine, and many theologians desirous of being heard. When it came time to draw a decree the bishops, few of them versed in theology, were embarrassed by the variety of opinion and the obscure and prickly subtleties with which authoritative Scholastics had treated it.[27] The final decree therefore avoided such subtleties, concentrating upon the assurance that original sin, whatever its nature and effect might be, was removed by baptism, and could not be removed in any other way, and that it was quite another thing than that natural penchant for sinning which might and did remain after baptism. Finally, without committing itself, the decree particularly declares that in what has been laid down on the doctrine of original sin, it does not pretend to include any opinion as to the sinlessness of the Virgin.[28]

It is impossible here to follow the theological discussion which followed, while the pope and curia wished to be well rid of the council, but considered it wiser to please the emperor by keeping it open, and occupied with theological discussions[29] in which the Franciscans said this, and the Dominicans denied it, etc. In March 1547 the council decreed that there were seven sacraments, neither more nor less; that the fact that the administrant of one of these sacraments was in *mortal sin* had no deleterious effect on the sacrament he conferred; that whoever said that the ceremonial practice in usage for the administration of these sacraments could be changed for others was anathema,[30] and a week later, on the ground that the prelates could no longer remain in Trent "without peril of their life" (an epidemic had appeared in the city) the council was transferred by decree to Bologna[31] where, after one adjournment, it adjourned more indefinitely three months later.[32]

---

[25] Decree of Fourth Session of the Council of Trent.
[26] Sarpi, II, lxiii.
[27] Sarpi, II, lxvi.
[28] Decree of Fifth Session of the Council of Trent.
[29] Sarpi, II, lxxviii.

Meanwhile Charles had won a military victory over the league of Protestant princes, arranging subsequently a temporary compromise on religious matters, conceding to Protestants the marriage of the clergy and the presentation of both bread and wine to the laity. He was now ready to see the council reconvened, but this the pope refused to do. Finally, at the end of 1549 he died, and one of the legates in the former council replaced him as Julius III.

From the transference of the council from Trent to Bologna to its reopening in Trent a period of nearly four years elapsed. It was, in effect, a different council. No French delegates were present, the Spanish delegates kept apart under orders of the Emperor Charles, the Protestants whom the emperor had ordered to appear found all the questions in which they were most interested already decided, with not the slightest disposition to reopen discussion of them. The question of the eucharist, concerning which no decree had yet been passed, and in which there had been at the beginning of the Protestant movement some disposition of compromise, had even been attended to before their arrival. The theologians in the assembly were given copies of the theses they were expected to refute, with the authorities in refutation, before the session opened.[33] Before the arrival of the Protestants everything with respect to this sacrament had been decided, save the question of allowing the *cup* to the laity, and the presiding legate suggested that the members might simply accept or reject, in full without discussion or change, articles which the theologians had prepared. This was rejected by a slender margin.[34]

---

[30] Decree of the Seventh Session of the Council of Trent, Canons I, XII, XIII concerning The Sacraments in General.

[31] Decree of VIIIth Session.

[32] Decree of IXth and Xth Sessions.

[33] Pallavicini, XII, i.

Two members of the Company of Jesus, one of them destined to be its second general, were present as the pope's theologians. Toward the end of the former session in Trent they had been dispatched thither by Paul III, with careful instructions from Loyola. They were to listen and think much, but to be slow to speak. In speaking they were to set forth judicially both sides, and in everything dispose the minds of the listeners to harmony; while slow to commit themselves to an opinion save with such guarded reservations as, "So, awaiting better opinion, I hold." They were to interest themselves in good works in the city, to make friends, to preach and listen to confessions when opportunity offered, present the *Spiritual Exercises*. Above all, they were to preserve perfect unity of action between themselves, and with a third member of the Company who was present as the proxy of the Cardinal of Augsburg. These three were to meet each evening, to discuss and plan in concert their joint campaign for the following day, and again each morning before the day's work began.[35]

Such a combination, already certain among themselves as to the direction in which they intended to lead the council, was hard to beat. In January 1552 the Protestants began to arrive. The latter part of the month they were allowed to speak. The next day the sessions were adjourned some fifty days. Many bishops began to depart, the Protestants left. An army under a Protestant prince came dangerously near. The council dissolved.

It did not however close this session without having enacted decrees and provided canons concerning the eucharist, penance, and extreme unction, in which every point of Protestant criticism of these three traditional sacraments slurring or questioning their efficacy, their divine authority, or the reservation of their administration to ordained and recognized priests in communion with the traditional Catholic Church were declared anathema.[36]

---

[34] *Cambridge Modern History,* II, 671, 672.

[35] Crétineau-Joly, *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus,* I, 251ff.

[36] Decrees of XIIIth and XIVth sessions of the Council of Trent.

Paul IV, who became pope in 1555, three years after the last preceding adjournment of the general council, had been long connected with reform policies. He had indeed resigned his benefices, and his offices as adviser in matters of heresy and reform, to assist in the formation of a new religious order (Theatines). Later he became a member of the commission which introduced the *Index*, and reinstated the Inquisition in Italy. As pope he attempted at the outset to strengthen the political position of the papacy, involving himself in bitter opposition to the Spanish influence in Italy, in intrigues with France, and in flagrant nepotism. Incurring enmity of Spaniards, of the emperor, of Elizabeth in England by questioning her legitimacy, and forced to dissolve his alliance with France, his papacy was a stormy one, toward the end of which, his political aims gone awry, he introduced numerous and severe measures of reform, in which he no longer, as earlier in his career, showed any disposition to compromise with the Protestant demands. To a pope who had a great estimation of himself,[37] who gave immediate instructions to his butler on becoming pope that he wished to be served "as fitting to a great prince," [38] the tradition of papal preëminence was manifestly too sympathetic to leave a single ear open to demands for the revival of the Council of Trent.

After he died, however (1559), so personally unpopular as to incite a public demonstration in which a statue erected to him by the Roman people was torn down, the palaces of the Inquisition and the Dominican Friary sacked, and even all the available monuments and coats of arms of his family disfigured or insulted,[39] under the new pope, Pius IV, the methods of papal policy were altered. Pius was affable, conciliating, an experienced diplomat. He recognized in the Spanish monarchy one of the strongest remaining props of the old Church. The one difficulty was that

---

[37] Pallavicini, XIV, ix, 5.

[38] Sarpi, V, xv.

[39] Pallavicini, XIV, ix, 6-9; Sarpi, V, xlvi. Owing perhaps to the animosity shown by Paul IV to Loyola, long before his ascension to the papal chair, the account of these disorders in Pallavicini is particularly detailed.

Spain was more anxious for an independent episcopate than to see the power of the papacy too strong. Protestantism was rife in France, and there came a call for a National Council, provided the general council did not promptly meet. Pius immediately turned his thoughts toward the council, not knowing whether or not to summon one; and whether, in case he decided it wiser not to call it, his better policy would be to refuse openly, or to appear to desire one, while forming or availing himself of difficulties which might postpone or evade it.[40]

Events and princes were insistent, and a bull was issued summoning the council to Trent for April, 1561. Then an embarrassing question arose: the emperor and the French wished a definite declaration that this was to be a new council and not a continuation of the old. The Spanish monarch and Church were equally insistent that it be a continuation. The Pope wished with the Spaniards, but hardly dared offend the other party. This difficulty was solved by leaving the matter one of sufficient doubt to be grounds for difference of opinion as to whether the council was, or was not, definitely declared a continuation of the one closed ten years earlier.[41] The course of events, in any case, so clearly defined the function of the council which finally met early in 1562 as to establish it as clearly a part of the council which had first met in 1545.

Although the form of an invitation, and the promise of safe-conduct, was tendered Protestants who might wish to appear, there was no longer any hope of utilizing this council as a means of healing the Protestant schism. This reassembling of the old Council of Trent was indeed the first general council of a new Catholic Church, with the task of settling the balance of power within that Church, and providing for Catholics north of the Alps, many of them living among Protestants. The final adjustment of questions involving national and papal rights in Catholic countries was not yet to receive its final settlement; but the provision of safeguards for Catholics daily subject to the temptation of living in a Christian world, in which many Catholic doctrines were recognizedly unacceptable to people still claiming to be Christians, was given minute consideration.

---

[40] Sarpi, V, xlix. On the contrary Laurence (*Cambridge Modern History,* II, 674) says that "at the beginning of his reign Pius IV looked forward to a council with no misgiving."

[41] Laurence (*Cambridge Modern History,* II, 675) says no definite pronouncement was made. Mirbt (*Encyclopædia Britannica*) says that Pius designated it a continuation. The Bull of Pius however can hardly be said to pronounce definitely either way, and so reads that it may have been drawn to be readable either way.

The history of this last assembly of the Council of Trent, which closed in December, 1563, hardly concerns us, but solely its effects. Indeed when it closed, its work was not finished. Committees and commissions, under papal supervision, continued for long to work out the details of matters implied by its decrees, or tasks definitely left to them. Indeed the task still remained of drawing up a definite and detailed *profession of faith,* something which had never previously existed in the Church,[42] save for the historical symbols; and when this appeared, as a form of oath to be taken by every Roman Catholic of the priesthood, it contained clauses dealing with matters deliberately ignored in the Council of Trent.

Two facts concerning this council are fundamentally significant: it was the last general council of the Church, and at its termination all its enactments and decisions sought confirmation from the pope. Not only were the attempts of the fifteenth century to revive the authority of general councils, which the opportunity of the Council of Constance for a time bade fare to reinstate in authority, definitely ended, but no later opportunity was given for serious raising of the question until, in the fullness of time, the bull declaring papal infallibility in matters of faith when pronounced *ex cathedra* (1870) disposed of the matter.

Not only did the Council of Trent effect broad, deep, and vastly important changes in the Church, but, during the period of more than forty years that elapsed between demand for this council and its final adjournment, together with those added years during which its unfinished work was completed by commissions of papal appointment, the religious world changed. Things which might reasonably have seemed possible in 1520, were clearly impossible in 1560.

---

[42] The authority of the symbols, such as the so-called Apostolic and Nicene Creeds, in the medieval church was that of other accepted matters of tradition. They were accepted so naturally that no one ever thought of requiring subscription to them. The basis of authority was *institutional.* The Reformation questioned the authority of the institution, thus for the first time introducing a doctrinal system which gave authoritative basis to the institution.

Adrian VI had written of Luther:

> That which strikes me most forcibly in Luther is that, whatever be the thesis he attempts to defend, he pushes it to the extremity. Once warned, far from moderating his views, he pushes still farther, not appearing to desire any other thing than to give himself over to still greater excesses.

Here Adrian voices what was doubtless the feeling of countless others, and just as Luther seemed to them to do, such must have seemed to them the whole course the Reformation took. In order to avoid such extremes, it was necessary to start from premises which were not Luther's premises. When the Council of Trent opened, doubtless the proper premises for safe reform had not yet been clearly defined. Had Adrian lived longer he might have found himself before the task of attempting to arrive at them. It is perhaps a dangerous affair to attempt to formulate these premises completely, but some seem evident enough. It was presumed, before the Council ended, that doctrinal stability and institutional stability were inextricably knit together, and that neither could be trusted as safe without a certain and single ultimate final authority. All Catholics everywhere were not yet ready to accept this without qualification, but it became the premise of papal policy, from thenceforth even more than before unwavering. From this point on one was not obliged to decide with himself whether he was willing, in theory, to sacrifice the authority of the Church to purity of doctrine, or vice versa. He whose religious emphasis tipped toward pure doctrine dared not touch the Church's traditional institutions, lest the stability of doctrine might be thereby weakened. He who had any one or more of many possible reasons not to wish the prerogatives of the Church disturbed, became equally zealous that doctrine should be handled with great care.

Premises which so linked together many sorts of conservative religious interests, left certain things still possible of accomplishment. We cannot follow all that was done and attempted in the way of reform. However, in the decade following the final adjournment of the Council of Trent the Congregation of the Index attempted a bit of reform which as an analogy may help to make clear what might be reasonably hoped for more generally.

> For long honest people and confessors had declaimed against the *Decameron* (of Boccaccio): I shall cite, among a thousand others, Boniface Vanozzi, who said that "those remarks on love, those so lascivious discourses, have opened large windows to idolatry, to heresies, to the most dissolute habits among us Catholics. Who could reckon the number of women led astray grace to the *Decameron* of Boccaccio would be stupefied and almost beside himself." But, since to deprive persons of studious purpose of a book regarded as an accomplished model of style would have been regrettable, one adopted the middle course of expurgating it. The master of the sacred palace picked out passages to be deleted or altered, and a deputation of Florentines, at the head of which was Vincent Borghini, arranged the book as it appeared, in 1573, with the approbation of Gregory XIII.[43]

Roman Catholicism emerged from the Council of Trent, purified less by reform than by expurgation. There seemed to be so many things undeniably good in its ideal, and so many other things which many found, if not ideal, at least convenient for some purposes inclusive of their own. It seemed to have been so conclusively proven by the fortunes of Protestantism that, if one once began reforming religion one never knew where and how the reform was to stop or be stopped. The question came to be less and less, "What should be cured?" more and more, "What may safely be touched?"

But even more important at the moment than reform was the question of defense. It is in the solution of this problem of defense the Council of Trent is accused of having hardened the Roman Catholic Church in the mold of Christian medievalism. Only in a very limited sense is this true. The Roman Church following the Council of Trent was not, could not have been, the medieval Church. It could do little more, in its so altered European situation, than borrow the authority and the prestige of the medieval Church; knit itself back to a frozen tradition, which assumed a unity that never existed, wrung out all the life, change, growth, transition, which, when once it was examined closely, left no such settled authority as the post-tridentine Church desired.

---

[43] Cantu, *La Réforme en Italie,* II, 673.

There was one form in which such a frozen tradition might be conveniently found, in orderly and comprehensive form: the scholastic philosophy, and more particularly in its very complete, able, and authoritative formulation by Thomas Aquinas. But the system once chosen for this purpose no longer remained, whatever of its textual integrity was respected, the thing it had been. The Scholastic philosophy of the thirteenth century had grown, of its inherent logic, with its habitual method, about a few universally accepted premises as to the nature of God, and of the Christian revelation. It was dogmatic only in the technical sense: that is, because it was taken to rest upon some premises not rationally derived, but authoritatively accepted. In itself it was an *explanation,* admitting in many places alternatives, and almost everywhere discussion.

Scholasticism, and whatever possible of medievalism, was asked in the post-tridentine Church to serve quite differently. The basic structure of the Church, which in the Middle Ages generally needed no defense, had now been under criticism. It was no longer a question of parallel and interacting growth between an institutional and an intellectual system. Ecclesiastical authority, which had here and there exerted itself through the Middle Ages to prune away dangerous sproutings, now took Scholasticism into its service in the definite relation of master and servant. Out of Protestant criticism and the long battle of the Council of Trent the institutional interests, and what they demanded of faith and attitude, had become clearly defined. The institution which was still in theory and ambition universal and divinely dominant, naturally chose the system which had grown up unquestioning as to that dominance and universality. But the system was no longer a method of rational research. It was rather an enclosure, with walls and towers, for the protection of a vast city, the weak places of which had been divulged, and its eminences mapped, for defending and attacking armies alike.

The Council of Trent established the power of the papacy not to be sure in Europe as Gregory VII had planned, but in the Roman Catholic Church. It formulated its doctrines as they had never before been formulated, while clearly leaving to papal authority the prerogative of further formulation. It made possible the preparation by the papacy of a profession of faith which would be binding upon all its priesthood, and a catechism for universal teaching among the laity. It made final and definite the ground upon which Roman Catholicism was to stand in a world in which there were Christian Protestants. By so doing Catholicism was not only stronger, because there was no longer opportunity for unobserved attrition; but also because, within the institution itself, it was now possible to define the territory, both of personal religion and of intellectual interest and inquiry. As we shall see, this latter opportunity resulted in a revival, both of intellectual activity and of mystic experience, both within the bounds of Catholic orthodoxy.

## LI

The history of Philip the Second is the history of Europe during the latter half of the sixteenth century.[1]

They beat him five times with sticks to the extremity of violent cruelty (*à outrance et fort cruellement*), and then, having brought a goat, they smeared his body with honey, and let the goat lick it with his rough and rasping tongue, until, in licking the honey, it stripped off with its tongue skin and flesh at the same time. . . . They extended his body on a bench, and tore apart, one after another, the muscles and bone. . . . He never cried out even once, nor gave vent to the slightest moan, which led the Hollanders to believe him possessed of the devil, and the Spaniards that God was aiding him.[2]

The late fifteenth and the sixteenth century saw a recrudescence of the Inquisition, one feature of which immediately reminds us that we are no longer in the Middle Ages. There was, to be sure, a papal inquisition in the sixteenth century, but where this institution left its most prominent marks upon the history of Europe in this period it was no longer under direct control of the pope, but of those most Catholic monarchs of Spain, two of whom (Charles V and Philip II) occupied portions of their long reigns with wars against two popes.

From the Spanish Inquisition most of the sensational details of diabolical cruelty have been gleaned, for use in testifying, either to the tyrannic zeal in persecution of the Catholic Church, of Christianity more generally, or of religion as a whole and everywhere. But, since we shall not be able here, in our limited space, to do justice to the hectic flush or to the cold finesse of cruelties that were practiced by the Inquisition in this period, we may, in casting our eyes upon the second passage quoted above, which recounts some few of the tortures inflicted upon a neurotically insensible fanatic who had assassinated no religious martyr, but rather a cold and religiously skeptical statesman, who succeeded in uniting under one banner of patriotism Catholics, Lutherans, Calvinists and Anabaptists, we may reflect that some at least, and perhaps most of the cruelty of the Inquisition of this period belongs less to Catholicism, Christianity, or religion, than to a sadist fever prevalent in the later sixteenth century.[3]

---

[1] Prescott, *Philip II,* Preface.

[2] Forneron, *Histoire de Philippe II,* III, 215-216, in recounting, in quotation from contemporary documents, the punishment inflicted by the revolutionary reformers in Holland upon the psychoneurotic murderer of William the Silent.

The history of the Spanish Inquisition in Europe divides into three chapters. Of these the first connects with the general history of the Jews in Christendom, with the unification of the Spanish monarchy, and with the financial difficulties which oppressed all monarchs everywhere in Europe just previous to the beginning of the sixteenth century. The second is most generally the history of the Catholic reaction in Spain, colored by the personality of Philip II, the hardening of the doctrine of absolute monarchy convinced of its divine basis, and the narrowing defensive measures of a nation falling rapidly from a brief period of wealth and political glory. The third is a far different tale, of how upon unfruitful soil in the Low Countries (Holland and Belgium) the same Inquisition which so quickly and effectively did its work in Spain succeeded only in consolidating patriotic feeling, and welding a new nationality, where, first of anywhere in Europe, it was perceived that religious toleration was advantageous to industry and commerce.[4]

We have had occasion to note before the gold hunger which marked the opening decade of the sixteenth century. The growth of commerce and trade which marked the closing decades of the fifteenth century brought about a scarcity of gold, which became so insufficient for the needs of exchange that its value increased rapidly, which meant a fall in prices.[5] Merchants, bankers, artisans profited, farmers and landlords, which included all the nobility and princes, suffered, since their incomes were based upon production of primary necessities, rather than upon the exchange of marketable goods. Most of all the bankers gained, as direct dealers in gold, and in credit based upon the precious metals. No class in Europe was better placed to profit by this situation than the Jews, who had for various reasons been more tempted than any other European group to keep their fortunes in liquid form. Also, in no country of Europe had the Jews prospered and gained social consideration as they had in Spain. In consequence, nowhere in Europe did they offer such tempting prey as here, and against them first of all the Inquisition revived in Spain was to be turned. We may therefore be tempted here to turn aside a moment to review the anomalous situation of the Jews in Christendom, leading up to their persecution and banishment from Spain at the end of the fifteenth century.

---

[3] A curious example of late sixteenth-century sadism is presented by a work (1591) entitled *Trattato degli instrumenti di martirio e delle varie maniere di martirizare,* illustrated by many prints of methods of torture, almost certainly elaborated, with considerable zest, by author and artist.

[4] Les bons comme les mauvais demandent la liberté de conscience; ils se laissent persuader que cette liberté est exigée par les interets et les convenances, qu'elle favorise la banque et le commerce." *Correspondence of Philip II,* Letter of Don Juan of Austria. Quoted by Forneron, *Histoire de Philippe II,* III, 22ff.

The process which made Jews a race of tolerated outcasts in Europe was gradual and slow. Their European history hardly antedates the sixth century. Previously, under Roman rule, scattered communities lived everywhere in Europe, under their own laws. Intolerance and persecution might arise, but it was local and sporadic, inspired by some zealous churchman in his immediate neighborhood. The Arian controversy, so long in being quenched, split the force of Christian persecution, since Arians were more tolerant than Athanasians. Then, in Spain, arose the first broad wave of persecution, which aimed at forced conversion, this was, however, forbidden by a council in Spain in 633. Those who had been converted, even if forcibly, were nevertheless obliged to remain Christians, and if they had resumed the Jewish faith might be compelled to return to Christianity.

> Although baptized Jews who have later apostatized deserve to have their property confiscated, their children, if believing Christians, may possess the paternal inheritance.[6]

---

[5] See Lavisse et Rambaud, *Histoire Generale,* V, 310.

[6] Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte,* sec. 290; also, same author, *Le Cardinal Ximenes,* chap. xviii.

Such, in general, was the policy of the Church for some centuries, backed by the long continuing prestige of Gregory the Great, who checked a movement of forced conversion in France. Populations were not generally hostile to Jews, bishops and popes generally tolerated them, and there were a number of friendly and naïve attempts to convert them by argument.[7] The end of the eighth and beginning of the ninth century has been called their "golden era." On south and southwest France they owned many fields and vineyards. Established in Germany, in the valley of the Rhine particularly, they were prohibited by law from owning land, and thus became merchants and money lenders, the latter trade closed to Christians because the taking of interest was forbidden them by old tradition, reiterated in the legal enactments of Charlemagne.[8]

Whatever tolerance and legal protection the Jews might enjoy,[9] their social status was unfavorable, and when the central governing power of the Carolingians weakened their fortune rested largely upon the caprice of local nobles or prelates. Intermarriage was a religious offense upon both sides. Separatist customs were essential to Jewish life. Christians dining with Jews might eat everything, but when, returning the compliment, Christians invited Jews, the Jews were obliged to refuse certain dishes. In the fifth century this caused trouble, and a *canon* forbade Christian priests to dine with Jews, "because they considered it undignified that Christians should eat the viands of Jews, while the latter refused to eat Christian dishes, thus making it appear as though the clergy were inferior to the Jews." [10] Indeed, many matters of religious custom, Christian prejudice aside, tended to separate the lives of Jews and Christians. All through the tenth and eleventh centuries Jewries or ghettos began to be established in European cities, the gates of which were closed and locked against their egress from sunset to sunrise, on Sundays, and on other Christian feasts. On the other hand, within their ghettos they were left

[7] One of the arguments against Jews was based upon the fact that there was no longer any Jewish king (the scepter had departed from Israel). Then a Jewish kingdom was discovered (the Chazars), but these monarchs unfortunately proved to be converts, not of Hebrew stock.

[8] *Capitula,* V, 36, VI, 50, for example.

[9] In Cologne a non-Jewish plaintiff, even though a priest, was obliged to bring his suit before a Jewish judge. Græetz, *History of the Jews,* III, 41.

[10] From a canon of the Council of Vannes (Græetz, III, 36).

very much alone, establishing local government and charitable institutions.

The social disabilities of Jews, the feudal prejudice against nobles entering trade, canon laws forbidding clergy to do so, the general prohibition against all interest as *usury* which bound all Christians alike, together with racial aptitude for and interest in trade and finance the Jews appear to possess, tended more and more to confine their conspicuous activities to the functions of merchants and money lenders. Their property being less secured by legal and social protection than that of Christians again tempted them to keep it in portable and liquid form. But, under the most favorable conditions dealers in money or credit are bound to profit by the misfortunes of others and by hard times. Some creditors are sure to take advantage of a debtor's weakness, and a distressed debtor, or one relieved by the accumulation of an interest bearing debt, is by no means certain to preserve an attitude of gratitude even to the most modestly exacting creditor. When lending money at interest was disapproved in principle it is hardly strange that those who lent it were scorned and often hated by those who resorted to them.

But, despite prejudices and prohibitions, or even because of them, it was often possible for Jews and Christians, the clergy even, to enter into mutually profitable relationships. Jews were very ready to purchase exemptions and privileges they could not otherwise acquire, which at times even popes might sell them. Through the intermediation of Jews, nobles and clergy might sometimes effect transactions they were prohibited from effecting more directly. For generations the German clergy connived with Jewish merchants engaged in supplying slaves (*slavs,* and hence the word for them in modern tongues) to Mohammedan masters in Egypt and Spain.[11] They also allowed Jewish and Christian merchants alike to store in churches the goods they used in such barter.[12]

---

[11] Thompson, *Feudal Germany,* 395.

[12] Grætz, 537-538. It was also a grievance of the Jews, at the time of their persecution in England under Henry III, that they were deprived of their accustomed right to store their treasures in churches, where it was safe from theft, because of the sanctity of church property.

And there were other ways of indirect and profitable coöperation with Jewish merchant-bankers. From very early a Jew-tax was exacted of them by princes and rulers generally, later also a tithe for the Church. But this was not all. They might be more sytematically *milked.* Rudolph of Hapsburg, founder of the political fortunes of that line, beginning as a petty baron of the Swiss border, ending as emperor and a great conquerer of territories for his house, solidified his financial position by borrowing of them, extorting from them, alternately encouraging legislation for and against them, profiting either way, as the Jews could always be made to pay for protection. Henry III of England called a *parliament of Jews,* "to take counsel for their own and his Majesty's welfare," the purpose being to collect by their means from Jews an assessment of almost half a million pounds, a very considerable sum toward the middle of the thirteenth century. In France Jews were allowed to exact high rates of interest, in order that the king and nobles might exact that much the more from them. So in various ways might feudal rulers suck wealth from their subjects, through a conduit which absorbed all the stench. In general, and over long periods, business life was by no means made impossible for them, and despite everything their wealth increased. Money was wrung from them, often mercilessly, but at the same time the opportunity for Jewish thrift and industry to garner it was not closed. As the historian Græetz says of them in northern France, they were "secure from expulsion and persecution, because they were needed, but they suffered from innumerable annoyances, and their moral sense was thereby blunted. They were restricted to the business of money getting, and they acquired as much as possible to be able to satisfy their tormenters." [13]

Such a situation, religious prejudice aside, was enough to increase their unpopularity. Added to everything else was the growing sense of Christian solidarity, made more definite in the program of such popes as Gregory VII and Innocent III. By the end of the eleventh century popular sentiment was sufficiently bitter to turn against the Jews, in many places, and particularly in Germany, the crusading spirit. In some cases, at this time, popular rage was abetted by ecclesiastics, but also in conspicuous cases the influence of clerics was exerted for their protection. But, as the Middle Ages advanced, the Church came to execrate them more and more openly and officially. Official action took form emphatically at the Fourth Lateran Council, which has been marked in a previous chapter as the apex of the Middle Ages. Then it was that the Church borrowed from Mohammedan custom the injunction that Jews should, throughout Christendom, wear a badge of their race and religion upon their clothing.

---

[13] *Ibid.,* III, 407.

And indeed, even long before this, it was at bottom, more than anything else, because of their outcast status in the eyes of the Church, that their other inconveniences and persecutions arose. Canon law gave Jews no recognized right of existence in Christendom, and in consequence they lacked entirely the protection of the Church which, for centuries, was the surest safeguard of justice which the common man possessed. The tradition of Roman Law was kinder to them, but the Roman Law did not exist in Germany before the fifteenth century, and Frankish code and feudal enactment and custom much weakened it as centuries went on in Gallic Europe. Preachers were comparatively free to inflame popular hatred against them. At Béziers, a very stronghold of Jewry in the south of France, it was long the custom to preach against them on Palm Sunday, inciting insult against them, and often bloodshed. In Toulouse, on Good Friday, the count had the privilege of giving the chief of the Jewish community a box on the ears, later commuted as a money payment. Ecclesiastics might tolerate persecution in which they took no active part. Indeed every effort of the Church to enforce unity of faith was bound, whether baffled or exuberent, to spill over against them. Not only the Crusades, but the Albigensian Crusade, the efforts to extirpate the Hussite heresy in Bohemia, the panic-fear caused by the Black Plague, turned immediately part of their force against the Jews.

In general, during the Middle Ages, the situation of the Jews in Europe derived from their peculiar, and upon medieval theory incongruous, position in Christendom. This nurtured all grounds for popular dislike, made them legitimate prey of extortionate rulers, removed them largely, not only from the protection of the Church, but from that of the law. The possibility of exploiting them, together with shreds of more charitable Christian tradition on the one hand, and the freedom with which avarice or hatred might be exercised against them on the other, made their history a patchwork of conditions, never so persistently unfavorable as to crush them, or divest them entirely of prosperity, yet never such as to render their property and lives better than insecure, as those of outcasts always have been.

There was one engine of medieval persecution, however, which could not be generally used against the Jews. This was the Inquisition. Jews were not heretics, and therefore over them this institution had no jurisdiction. But converted Jews, once returned to their Jewish practices, became so, and against such the full terrors of the Inquisition might be loosed. This made of the treatment of converted Jews in Spain a peculiar chapter of the history, both of the Inquisition and of the Jews in Europe.

The period of Moslem domination in Spain had been one of toleration generally, both to Jews and Christians, and this period was of lasting influence upon the situation of the Jews after Christian reconquest. Habits of intercourse between Jews and Christians had grown, and moreover both Jews and Moslems occupied a position of such economic importance as to suggest the wisdom of conciliation on the part of Christian conquerors, as indispensable to the peaceable establishment of Christian dominance. Morever, not until the end of the fifteenth century did a central government exist in Spain, strong enough to enforce any regular policy throughout the peninsula. So the toleration of Jews was slow of dislodgment. The decree of the Lateran Council, relative to wearing a *stigma* upon the clothing, had hardly been enforced. In Castile there was no such requirement until 1371.

Such tolerance placed Spain more and more out of line with the tendency in Europe generally, and with the policy of the Curia. A succession of popes remonstrated, or ordered the enforcement of this decree. A council held in 1311 denounced the Spanish practice which required the testimony of Jewish witnesses in obtaining the conviction of a Jew.[14] The canons of councils still continued to testify to the freedom with which Jews and Christians mingled. One, presided over by a papal legate, declared that infidels should not be allowed to attend services in the churches, and that Christians should not attend marriages and funerals of infidels.[15] It had long been prohibited Christians to have Jewish and Saracen physicians attend them when ill, and a prohibition shows that this custom none the less was general.[16] As the fourteenth century wore on legislative assemblies began to pass laws limiting free intercourse, but even by the end of the fifteenth century ghettos did not exist in all Spanish cities, nor were all Jews required to live in them where they did exist.[17]

Pressure against the mingling of Jews and Christians became continually stronger. It came to a head at the end of the fourteenth century in Seville, where a prominent prelate, devout, charitable, but fanatic against Jews, continually denounced them in his sermons. For a time the king restrained them, but when he died leaving a successor eleven years old, the prelate defied the civil authorities. He demanded the destruction of synagogues in Seville. Finally the Christian population rose up and destroyed the ghetto, massacring most of the inhabitants. From Seville the movement spread to other cities. "In a short time more than a hundred thousand families . . . perhaps a million persons, renounced the law of Moses to embrace the faith of Jesus Christ." [18] Thus was created a large class of converted Jews (*conversos*) who were, on the accession of Ferdinand and Isabella, long to occupy the Inquisition.

These *conversos* married in the most important Spanish families, some of which in the male, and almost all of which in the female line mounted to Jewish connections.[19] Not all of the conversions were sincere, naturally, and even with the passage of a century it was no strange thing for many of them to practice Jewish customs. Obliged to have their children baptized, as a protection against persecution, "they washed away the stain on returning home. They dressed their stews with oil instead of lard . . . sent oil to replenish the lamps of the synagogue; with many other abominable ceremonies of their religion," writes a priestly chronicler.[20] But what was even worse, they rose to high offices, both in Church and State, and displayed with conspicuous ostenation their wealth. Moreover as the *conversos* numbered far the larger portion of the wealthier Jews, they made taxes upon infidels far less profitable than they otherwise might be, as a result of their conversion.

---

[14] Lea, *Inquisition in Spain,* I, 72.

[15] Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte,* sec. 705.

[16] *Ibid.,* canons of same council.

[17] Lea, *Inquisition in Spain,* I, 77-78.

[18] Llorente, *Histoire Critique de l'Inquisition d'Espagne* (trans. Pellier), I, 141. Llorente, whose work appeared in Spanish at the beginning of the nineteenth century, was secretary of the Inquisition of his time in Spain.

[19] *Ibid.,* Preface, xxvi.

Converted Jews, however, if convicted of the slightest lapse toward Jewish custom, were possible prey of the Inquisition. The Inquisition had had no conspicuous history in Spain previous to the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella. Indeed a papal inquisition could have maintained little organized force over the whole of a territory which was only gathered into so few as four kingdoms by the beginning of the fifteenth century, in which the power of the monarchs themselves was weakened by the independent power of great nobles, by traditions and charters of popular liberty, and by no great willingness to fall in with the aspiring program of the medieval papacy. However, Isabella was a good Catholic, who had been early urged by her confessor to "devote herself to the extirpation of heresy," should she ever come to the throne, and her husband Ferdinand was determined, when he came to divide with her the united rule over the whole of Spain, to leave no stone unturned for the unification of his realm, the crushing of independent power wielded by nobles and prelates, and the establishment of absolute monarchy in the realm. To all this the Inquisition might be of assistance, upon the one condition that it was not controlled by Rome. So, after considerable protocol, it was established, with the power of naming and removing the inquisitors clearly lodged with the Spanish monarchs.

---

[20] Quoted from the chronicle of the Curate of Los Palacios, by Prescott, *Ferdinand and Isabella,* chap. vii.

Aside from the converted Jews there was, to be sure, no class of heretics of particular importance, but these alone offered sufficient temptation. Not only were they possessed of a large proportion of the wealth of the realm, and the fact that the property of heretics was of right subject to confiscation, by very old tradition, but Jewish blood was pretty generously mingled with all the blue blood of the realm, so that through them also noble families of inconvenient power might often be reached. Also, Ferdinand and Isabella had entered upon their reign under the most inconvenient and even humiliating circumstances of poverty. The financial condition of Spain was entirely disorganized, owing to repeated debasing of the coinage, minted by a large number of lay and ecclesiastical princes who possessed that right. In short, nothing was quite so necessary to the establishment of the ambitious program of these two able monarchs as solid assets—and these their *converted* subjects conspicuously possessed.[21]

The Inquisition was finally established by edict in 1481. Its prey was clearly marked, and a list of thirty-seven articles drawn up, each of which described various customs which laid the person guilty of them open to suspicions of secretly practicing the Jewish faith. If one were seen to wear clean linen on Saturday, gave or received presents during certain festal periods of the Jewish calendar, ate the same food as Jews or with them at table, recited the Psalms without adding the Christian refrain (*Gldoria Patri*), and even other acts open easily to interpretation in which no Judaizing intent might be intended, was in danger of the Inquisition, according to one or another of these questionable practices. To be both profitable prey and accused meant a certain conviction, and at the end of such conviction confiscation went along even with absolution.

In anticipation of trouble many of the *conversos* began to leave Spain, which was of course not to be permitted. The first official act of the Inquisition was an edict that charged the nobles of all ranks to arrest all *conversos* who attempted to flee the realm. Soon there were burnings at the stake, but rather as a means of breeding terror than as the necessary consequence of conviction. Some were stubborn, and would not *confess* to something which they had perhaps not done, as a means of saving their life and losing merely their property. Some were safer dead than alive in any case. Also, that such an institution should attract to its administration not only the avaricious, but the fanatic and the sadist, is hardly strange.

---

[21] "Il sera facile de se convaincre . . . que le judaïsme ne fût que le prétexte de l'éstablissement de l'Inquisition par Ferdinand V, et que le veritable motif fût . . . un systéme de confiscation," Florente, Preface.

Two years were consumed in the organization of the institution, during which, however, it continued to operate in its own *ex tempore* manner. Then the administration was placed in the hands of the confessor of Queen Isabella, *Thomas de Torquemada.* Less than a year later he received the commendation of the pope:

> We have heard with the greatest pleasure and rejoice exceedingly that you, who are furnished both with doctrine and authority, have directed your zeal to those matters which contribute to the praise of the Lord and the utility of the orthodox faith. We commend you in the Lord, and exhort you, cherished son, to persevere with tireless zeal in aiding and promoting the cause of the faith, by doing which, as we are assured you will do, you will win our special favor.[22]

Indeed the curia had no reason to complain of the Inquisition, even though it had passed from its control in Spain. Influential prisoners of the Inquisition were repeatedly sending appeals to Rome against the decrees of Spanish inquisitors, all of which pleas cost money. And sometimes they were granted what they desired, which necessitated further payments, although the authorities in Spain would not allow the papacy to reverse their decisions, and it was diplomatically arranged that such papal interference need not be taken seriously in Spain.

So, for a score of years, the Inquisition continued, with diminishing financial returns, the confiscation of the property of the *conversos,* there being always mingled with them victims sought for other reasons. It has been calculated that, while Torquemada was chief, a period of eighteen years, there were something over one hundred thousand victims, of whom some nine per cent were burned. In 1492 the unconverted Jews were expelled from Spain by royal decree. Ten years later the unconverted Moors were expelled from Castile, but they were an element of too great importance in some parts of the realm to risk such severity. However a rebellion of the Moors in one part of Spain brought a short period of forced conversion, and an aftermath of return to Mohammedan practice, with consequent activity of the Inquisition, which we need not attempt to follow. Indeed the persecution of the Moorish converts reaches over into the time when the Inquisition began to meet the first stirrings of Lutheran heresy in Spain. All through the reign of Charles V the Inquisition was active, not only in Spain but in the Netherlands. It was however used with some prudence, and there were even articulate attempts to reform some of its methods of procedure.[23] But with the reign of Philip II the Spanish Inquisition truly entered into its own: the determined scourge of Protestant heresy, and a useful tool in political and economic emergencies which arose.

---

[22] Letter of Sixtus IV to Torquemada, quoted by Lea, *The Inquisition in Spain,* I, 174.

The revival of the Inquisition in 1559 is, among other things, a study in sixteenth-century human psychology. The important personages of this century whose actions were complicated by convictions appear to be the most puzzling. One assesses more easily the character of Elizabeth than of Mary Tudor. One feels himself less likely to mistake the motives of Henry VIII or Francis I than those of, perhaps at bottom a simpler character, Charles V. That Sir Thomas More died for his religious conviction is more evident than just what in final predominant accent those religious convictions were. Indeed, as one looks over the century as a whole, one is tempted to believe that, aside from religion, there was no basis for conviction in this century. Not, to be sure, until the nineteenth century was it to be urged clearly and frankly that there was a deed-value in conviction (or faith) of some sort or other. Opportunism was in the sixteenth century a watchful experimental anarchy, egoism an adventure without a chart. The amount of clear-cut denial of religious authority was certainly very small, negligibly small. Calculated exploitation of religion, in which some measure of faith was not mixed, from the side of the exploiter, was even smaller, since the convicted atheists were more likely to be speculating philosophers than men of action. The stream of religious faith ran deep and troubled, between twisted and jutting banks. In its harassed center men swam, floundered, floated, or sank, as they best could. But where conviction aimed to play a directing rôle, it was divided between those who looked forward with even too extravagant hopes, and those who looked backward in fright. The conservatives were on the defense, and on the defense with all assistance they might gain from the egoism and experimentation of their time. It was no longer, as in the medieval inquisition period, a matter predominantly of saving souls with orthodox or heterodox religion. Religious reform now held either a promise or a menace for the entire social order.

---

[23] Llorente, I, 376ff., has a chapter on such attempts to reform the institution, which begins: "Jamais l'Inquisition d'Espagne n'a couru autant de risque d'être supprimée, que sous l'inquisitor Adrien (later the pope Adrian VI) . . . pendant les premières années du regne de Charles V. Lorsque ce jeune monarque vint en Espagne, il était disposé à abolir l'Inquisition, et persuade qu'il fallait au moins y organiser la procedure suivant les règles du droit naturel, et sur le modele de tous les autres tribunaux."

So must we judge defensive religious measures of the sixteenth century. Nearly a century ago Prescott wrote of the Spanish Inquisition, "It is remarkable, that a scheme so monstrous as that of the Inquisition, presenting the most effective barrier, probably, that was ever opposed to the progress of knowledge, should have been revived at the close of the fifteenth century, when the light of civilization was rapidly advancing over every part of Europe.[24] The period of such naïve reflection is past. Not until the present social order has passed into a succeeding one shall it be known, by our descendants, just what monstrous and effective barriers the civilization of to-day will invent or utilize, when it shall feel itself dangerously menaced. The story of the Inquisition which began with the reign of Philip II is a tale of tyranny, trickery, injustice, oppression, cruelty, involving monstrous horrors. It is, however, a short tale, and, if we are to judge by the standard of immediate success, a successful policy. Hardly a dozen years of Philip's reign had passed ere its task of stamping out the threat of Protestant heresy was accomplished. Conviction aside, and the religious conviction of Philip II is hardly a matter of doubt, who would be so hardy as to expect a ruler or ruling group to reject a tool so palpably extended, and which might prove so effective?

---

[24] Prescott, *Ferdinand and Isabella,* chap. vii.

We need not stop here to consider the methods and eventful course of the Spanish Inquisition under Philip II. As for methods of procedure, and so far as fanatic zeal controlled it, it differed little from the procedure and religious motive of the medieval institution. The change was rather in the more complicated interests and motives which directed it. First of all it becomes clear that Protestant heresy in Spain never grew to be, whether or not it might have become, a popular movement. In consequence of this fact, among other reasons, the victims of this Inquisition were predominantly persons whose personalities stood out with prominence, with an independence of thought which made of them leaders; men and women who marched some steps before the mass, anachronisms in a Spain which was soon and easily to hide in stagnation its reactionary head behind the Pyrenees, cut off from the general trend of change in the rest of Europe.

But there was still another reason for the many prominent figures which the Inquisition attacked in Spain. This reason was political. Spain, first of all European nations, accepted the institutions of absolute monarchy, which were in the next century to descend more broadly upon Europe. Nowhere else in Europe did the Inquisition effectively serve in this direction. Doubtless Spain too, in its own manner, wished to rest secure from troubling currents which the sixteenth century set in motion. But elsewhere in Europe, ere this desire grew to the extent of playing into the hands of absolute monarchy, the Reformation had done its work and tranquillity was arranged with less conspicuous atrocity.

Philip II, among everything else that he was—a child of the sixteenth century, with Machiavelli handy; a laborious ruler who doubtless at bottom wished the good of those only of his subjects for whom he cared, the Spaniards, who have repaid him in this at least, that he remained almost up to the present the semi-legendary king who symbolized Spain's one-time grandeur; a troubled monarch, whose many problems covered Europe entire, and in all of which religion played a part; a neurotic with an unfortunate inheritance, shutting himself more and more within a complicated red tape of inactivity, in moments which demanded prompt decision; a convinced ruler by divine right—was still one other thing. His conscience haunted him, as it had always troubled his father, Charles V. There seems little doubt but that this conscience drove him on, among other things, tormented with the fear that, should he allow one single heretic to offend the majesty of God, or trouble the religious faith of God's people, this same God would one day call him to account for his laxity.

As he lay suffering upon his deathbed those about asked whether he was in pain. "Yes, I suffer," he replied, "but far more than my bodily pains, my sins make me suffer!" Then, turning to his confessor beside the bed, he added, "My father, you are here as the mandatory of God, and I protest that whatever you indicate as necessary to my salvation, I shall do it. Consequently, you are responsible for my salvation, for my soul." And for him, during his lifetime, there seems little doubt but that, among other motives no doubt which often entered on tempting occasions, his zeal for the Inquisition was an expiation of other sins. Such a man was necessarily prey to his confessors and religious advisers, likely to be men who saw less broadly, even more fanatically, than he saw himself.

> The year that he lost his great fleet [recounts the Bishop of Valencia] I told him that he need not seek far to find the reason God had in permitting this disaster. The veritable cause is the tolerance granted the Moors in Spain. The king has fallen into the sin of Saul. God sent him a prophet, commanding him to destroy the Amalekites, leaving no man, woman, or child, not even an infant at the breast. Saul did not destroy them all, and the indignation of God has fallen upon him.[25]

And so died Philip II, and his Inquisition lived on, not so much because needed any longer, but because its work had been so well done, and its less intensive activity might preserve what a few years had created. In part it was a portion of the machinery of the Counter Reformation, and as such it served for a time in Italy. Here Giordano Bruno was its most distinguished victim, and Galileo, not at all minded to die for religion, was allowed to live a virtual prisoner in a lonely country villa. From Italy, however, most of the leaders of Protestant thought escaped without much difficulty. One of them, having escaped from prison, probably through the connivance of his guards, was soon appointed professor in Pavia, and when papal influence forced him from there he was able to take refuge, first in Venice, then in Ferrara, before obliged to flee to Switzerland.[26] Even in Italy it was impossible permanently to defy the Inquisition, but it was far from having universal sympathy in places of power. But in Italy the task was not at all that of Spain. In Italy religious unity was generally desired, political unity was not. In Spain political unity had been forged with the assistance of the Inquisition, and with its assistance it was to be maintained. Here lay a double temptation to use the institution in the Netherlands, which rested far less easily under the hand of Philip II than that of his more sympathetic and prudent father, Charles V.

---

[25] Quoted from the letters of Don Juan de Ribera to Philip III, by Forneron, IV, 291, 292.

We need not here attempt, more than in the case of the Inquisition in Spain, to tell the story of its course and ultimate fate in the Low Countries. As the former story has been told for English readers by Lea, so the story of the Netherlands in the later sixteenth century has been read, or easily may be, by English readers, in the romantic pages of Motley, or the excellently documented account of Prescott. It will repay us, however, to note how different was the situation than that of Spain, when the attempt was made to use Spanish machinery there.

We need not go back into the history of those lowlands which had first sheltered Norse pirates, and then gradually evolved a population among the first to thrive during the later medieval period. With the wealth of this country, fed both upon industry and commerce, the House of Burgundy had risen to affluence, such as made the Ducal Court, during the mid-fifteenth century, the pattern and inspirer of the most florid and often absurd extravagance of fashionable mode and amusement. Then, after the struggle between Louis XI of France and Charles the Bold (or Rash) of Burgundy, the Duchy of Burgundy was added by marriage to the Hapsburg entourage. Here in the Netherlands Charles V was born and passed his youth, indeed almost all his time until called upon to rule óver Spain as well, to which was soon to be added the office of Holy Roman Emperor.

---

[26] Celio Curione. Cantu, *La Réforme en Italie,* II, 562, reproduces a dialogue written by Curione, to tell of his escape from prison. His tale was that he escaped by giving the guard to shackle, a stick of wood, stockinged and stuck into his shoe in place of his leg.

Flemish and Dutch burghers had not for long been the easiest subjects to handle. One of the first important uprisings of this class in the Middle Ages had taken place in Ghent. Charles V, with duties and interests extending from one extremity of Europe to another, had never had opportunity, if he had sought it, to bear with a heavy hand upon these provinces. Indeed he loved them well, and ruled them wisely, with the consequence that they retained much independent power, the larger part of which was wielded by a few powerful nobles, linked to the ruler in oath and sentiment by the *Order of the Golden Fleece,* a feeble and romantic reminder of Arthur's *Round Table* and the days and knights of chivalry.

Then, among an industrious population, busy making cloth and money out of wool from the sheep which were making their own trouble across the Channel in England; among rich merchants and bankers, who traded with the Old and then also the New World—among these nobles, who understood the temper and interests of these classes as no Spaniard could—there drifted the new religious ideas. Erasmus himself was a Hollander, born in Rottendam. But upon the heels of Erasmus came Luther, and Zwingli, and Calvin, and the still more radical Anabaptists. In Spain it was Lutheran ideas mainly that touched, awakening in a few souls among clergy, monks, nuns, and laity, desire for a more *inward* and less mechanized religion. The Low Countries, however, divided in sympathy, as they were indeed divided in race. Also, among the city populations, as elsewhere often during the revolutionary period, the most radical ideas were the most acceptable. Upon the crest of one wave of enthusiasm there broke out an iconoclastic movement, which smashed, tore, whitewashed, and otherwise demolished works which might have remained works of art, even had they ceased to be objects of pious contemplation.

Against this Philip II knew but one remedy—his Inquisition. Saying good-by for always to his provinces in the Netherlands, hiding himself in his new palace, built on a cold and dreary plateau of his country because the climate fitted the monarch's feeble health, he stubbornly insisted that heretics should be burned, and that all who resisted him were heretics, here as everywhere in Europe. But here he dared not take active steps against the leaders. The execution of two of them brought down a storm upon him. And here burghers would not be subject to priests or Rome. Even an attempt to create new bishoprics was resented. And, while his ministers in the Netherlands were distracted, urging policies which were not only not accepted, but in letters which were not answered, a few local princes, under the cool leadership of William of Orange (whom people called The Silent, so well could he keep his counsel) drew closer and closer to the hearts and interests of the people, Philip stubbornly insisted upon his Inquisition, hardly even put in practice in its Spanish form, while the storm rose higher and higher, and swept his provinces away. So, in brief, were the Low Countries prepared for the rôle of being the cradle of ideas of religious tolerance in Europe, various shades of Protestant opinion here leagued together, in rebellion against the political tyranny of a ruler who made not even an attempt to understand their needs, problems, or interests, and against the religious tyranny of an institution framed by and for people quite other than themselves.

We shall not be able in chapters following to carry on the religious history of the Netherlands, but now and then we may come upon these Dutchmen, and almost always as conciliating religious differences, in a Synod of Dort or an *Ethics* of Spinoza; sowing seeds of Protestant ferment, as in the mind of Cornelius Jansen, founder of the Jansenists; rejecting religion as the basis of government and order, to found it upon law; opening up the way to peaceful and profitable trade, with the *Laws of War and Peace* of Grotius, founder in the modern sense of the formulation of principles of international law. Indeed, if the Inquisition in Spain largely accomplished its purpose, in the Netherlands it fathered its antithesis.

# LII

We were occupied, in the early chapters of this volume, with the gradual escape of the human spirit from the intellectual and institutional formula brought to its culmination during the thirteenth century; and subsequently with the political and social disruption caused by a new attitude toward life, and the growth of new interests, which on the one hand liberated egoism, and on the other hand attempted to bind this liberated egoism back again into a pattern of social order, on the basis of religion that aimed, in a new sense, to center religion in this liberated individuality.

Protestantism had its two accents, one the Lutheran accent of liberation, the other the Calvinist emphasis upon obedience. So too the Roman Catholicism developing subsequent to the formulated program of the Council of Trent was to have two similarly divergent emphases; of which we have already glanced at one: the new subjective discipline of Ignatius Loyola and the Jesuit Company. It was also in Spain that the movement of liberation was inspired. Here, amidst the most uncompromising attempts to close every way to the entrance of disorganizing novelties in the religious life, aspiration toward the untrammeled heights of subjective religious experience found a way of egress, dangerous to be sure, and suspect of religious authority, but a way none the less, through which it pressed, in an attenuated atomized spray of contemplative mysticism.

"Spain, fountain of pride in a valley of misery"; [1] Don Quixote, a pot on his head for a helmet, and mounted on a spavined bony nag, tilting at a windmill, and beaten to a jelly by ruffians; country where, in the later sixteenth century, if one were neither a monk or a soldier or a valet he was in continual danger of dying of starvation; [2] where, none the less the meanest Spaniard of pure blood boasted himself "as noble as the king, save for lack of money" (*Somos hidalgos como el rey, dineros menos*);[3] where a cobbler, once he had quit his shop, and bound on his sword and dagger, would scarcely lift his hat to a customer met in the street.[4] Everyone almost, in short, must make himself a slave for the assurance of his dinner, while ready to risk his life in defense of an absurdly conventionalized sense of honor. The sharp contrasts of the Renaissance in Italy even were less psychologically devastating than those of Spain in the second half of the sixteenth century, where men were enmeshed in tyranny: tyranny of material circumstances, tyranny of political rule, tyranny of venal justice, tyranny of religious persecution. Where, at the same time, egotism vaunted in the most extravagant sensibility to suspected insult. Where the romantic imagination demanded that the disappointed maiden tear out her hair, or dig her nails into her cheeks; where anger was scarcely expressed with fitting zeal unless displayed in maniac fury.

---

[1] Letter of an Englishman in Spain (1562).

[2] Forneron, *Histoire de Philippe II,* I, 130.

Even the most original and exalted genius does not ascend through empty atmosphere, but mounts with the assistance of accumulated and formulated experience of others before him. The Spanish mystics, even their great inspirers, Teresa of Jesus and John of the Cross, do not stand alone, but had their antecedents and inspirers. The movement was, however, a new departure, a movement appropriate to the Renaissance, and one of the most complicated and strange examples of the many ways in which, among different conditions, the first wrenchings of this liberation of the ego were accomplished. Here a particular attitude of mysticism, already implied and hinted at, was more clearly defined than ever before, and we may stop to define this attitude.

For mysticism, even confined to the Christian tradition, is a term so broad as to be confusing. It may cover the almost inevitable psychological accompaniments of attempts to mortify the flesh, in the manner of the early Christian ascetics. It may embrace Augustine's interest in the psychological happenings of his own nature, as instruments toward knowledge of God and Man. Benedict's discipline of *conversion* incidentally accumulated mystical experience. There is also that mystic tradition of definite intellectual aim (invariably disturbing to doctrinal regularity) exemplified in Scotus Erigena and Meister Eckhart. Francis of Assisi, with his dramatic passion of loving sympathy aiming to *suffer with* Christ, encouraged in himself and others contemplative concentration upon the Passion, creative of the sort of experience upon which mystics feed. Finally, although the purpose of Loyola's *Spiritual Exercises* was practical rather than mystic, still the introspective habit and the surrender of individual volition these exercises aimed to effect was bound to cross and parallel in many places the mystic way.

---

[3] Brantôme, *Rodomontases espagnoles.*

[4] Dutch traveler in Spain.

Elements of all these preceding mystic adventures entered into the making of the Spanish school of mystics. There was, however, to develop here, to grow clear and self-conscious, an emphasis making the mystic experience itself more than ever before its own end. Asceticism, contemplation, humility, poverty, submission; all the varied means to salvation which had accumulated mystic experience or technique, here became means primarily to the mystic experience itself. This type of experience, more and more consciously induced, nurtured, analyzed, came to stand upon its own feet. The eternity for which men had attempted to strip themselves by mortification of the temporal flesh, or toward which, adding or subtracting conceptual images, they had attempted to think their way, came now to rest in the mystic experience itself.

Because here the mystic experience is no longer a means to salvation but, in everything save its lack of permanency, salvation itself, these mystics, after a few initial jealousies and suspicions which no innovation in religion can hope to evade, escaped even in sixteenth-century Spain the rapidly accumulating trammels of doctrine and discipline. It was not necessary for them to traverse barricaded boundary lines of doctrine or ecclesiastical prerogative. They were not, like other Christians, going anywhere, on legs of bone and muscle nor on wings of thought. Night and day, darkness and light, joy and despair, mortification and illumination, were in *themselves.* They needed not, amidst whatever tyranny, to be troubled by any Church authority, for the Church could touch them only with powers, prerogatives, or weapons which they turned to food, transmuting, sublimating them in ways to which they might remain sublimely unconscious, so rapt elsewhere were their thoughts and intentions. They might safely feed upon the Bible even, for they did not seek in it theories as to the nature and operation of salvation, but food and light in the circular pilgrimage which preoccupied them.

We may turn our attention to this type of mysticism, developing so remarkably at the precise moment and in the precise place where religious and political tyranny were at their apex, and enabling by its tradition the mystic mood or emphasis to find congenial home in the new Roman Church, more congenial even than it ever yet has found in Protestant Christianity.

St. Teresa of Jesus, from whom this movement took its rise, was of the order of the Carmelites, behind which was a tradition of the hermit type of life, and a strange legendary history connecting it with the Hebrew prophet Elijah and his followers, and with the later Essenes of the period just preceding Jesus. Members of this order had heard Peter's sermon the day the Holy Ghost descended upon the little community of Christians in Jerusalem, and had been then converted. The Christian loss of the Holy Land had driven the community (to pass from legend to history) from Mount Carmel to Cyprus. Thence they spread to Sicily, and to the continent of Europe. The primitive Carmelite Rule dated from the beginning of the thirteenth century, prescribing a life of silence, seclusion, prayer, abstinence and austerity. The monks lived separately in little huts or cells, assembling only for the services of the chapel. But the move to Cyprus, and the overflow into Europe succeeded the formulation of this Rule. In Europe the Carmelites soon attained a new rule, which assimilated them in form of life and ideal to the Dominicans and Franciscans, and in this form the order grew popular and spread. But with this change there came relaxation of Carmelite ideal, leading to reform and schism in the order, to which movement Teresa belongs. It is the light which she sheds upon the mystic life which will mostly occupy us; but before passing to her inward life, it is of importance to note that she was most active as a reformer of her order, and that her reforms revived and reinstated the provision for silence and solitude which was the early tradition of this community. This austere and prayerful silence and solitude was the background out of which grew, and against which was projected the rich and intricate mystic experience which she described and analyzed with the clarity of genius.

Teresa, in the *Autobiography* written as she approached the age of fifty years, speaks several times of her fondness for confessing often,[5] and particularly to learned men.[6] For twenty years she endeavored to find one who could understand her.[7] This fact helps to explain her *Autobiography,* which sets forth acutely and searchingly her religious experience, and is more personally a confession than those of Augustine, who is led again and again from his personal experiences to discourse upon broader and more objective philosophical matters.

> As I had virtuous parents, and such as feared God, this would have been sufficient, together with the other favors our Lord bestowed upon me, to have made me good, if I had not been so wicked. My father took great delight in reading good books, and he had them in Spanish, that his children might read them. This circumstance, together with the care my mother took to make us say our prayers, and to show us the way to be devout to our Lady and some other saints, began to effect me when I was six or seven years old, to the best of my remembrance.[8]

When Teresa was twelve years old her mother died. "I threw myself," she writes, "before an image of our Lady, beseeching her, with many tears, to be a mother to me." [9]

While too slow, she confesses, to learn the good things her mother taught, she had acquired from her, even before her twelfth year, the habit of reading romances. "I was so addicted to this habit," she confesses, "that if I could not obtain some new book, it seemed to me I could not be happy."[10] There came too an "overgreat nicety about finery and neatness."[11] Then, in her fourteenth year, an older female relation became her intimate, whose conversation was so light that already, before her death, the mother used every polite method to discourage her visits to the house. To remove Teresa from this influence she was placed in an Augustinian convent in her home town. After a week of unhappiness there she began to experience more quiet and comfort than ever in her father's house. She had "the particular favor of always pleasing persons" wherever she might be, and was soon beloved of the nuns.[12] One of these greatly influenced her, recounting the manner of conversion, by reflecting upon the Gospel passage, "Many are called, but few are chosen." In time she began to feel that to be a nun was "the better and more secure state,"[13] and that the labors and troubles involved "could not be greater than the pains of purgatory." Justly deserving hell, it should not be, she thought, accounted much to live the earthly life, as it were in purgatory, if afterwards she might go "straight to heaven." She was still, as she confesses, in her inclination toward the religious life, "more influenced by servile fear than by love."[14]

---

[5] *Life of Saint Teresa, Written by Herself,* trans. from the Spanish by the Rev. John Dalton, 54, 62, 71.

[6] "I began to confess to him, for I was always fond of learned men," *ibid.,* 670.

[7] *Ibid.,* 62.

[8] With these sentences the *Autobiography* begins.

[9] *Ibid.,* 49.

Fainting fits, accompanied with burning fevers, began to assail her. She found comfort in the letters of Jerome to Roman ladies of the fourth century who had turned their backs upon fashionable life. She acquainted her father with her intention to enter a nunnery, meanwhile persuading one of her brothers to become a monk.

Leaving home was however a trying experience:

> When I was leaving my father's house, I believe that at my death my feelings will not be greater than they were then; for it seems to me that every bone in my body was then disjointed; and as I had no love of God to remove the love I had for my father and friends, all that I did was with such great violence, that if our Lord had not helped me, my own considerations would never have been able to advance me forward.[15]

---

[10] *Ibid.*, 51.

[11] *Ibid.*, same page.

[12] *Ibid.*, 54.

[13] *Ibid.*, 57.

[14] *Ibid.*, 58.

[15] *Ibid.*, 59.

On taking the habit of a novice, however, she attained "such feelings of delight" as never left her afterwards.

The change of life affected her health unfavorably. Fits of fainting increased. "My infirmity," she says, "was so great that it almost always nearly deprived me of my senses, and sometimes entirely took them away."[16] She was taken from the convent for a cure, at the home of a sister who lived in the country. She as yet knew nothing of the mystic procedure in prayer, but found a book called *The Third Alphabet,* treating of the prayer of *recollection.* She began to spend much time in solitude, to confess very often, though unable to find a competent confessor.

> In these beginnings, His Majesty began to confer on me such great favors, that at the end of the time I remained there in this solitude (which was about nine months) though I was not free from offending God, having neglected what the book directed me to do, from an idea that such great watchfulness was almost impossible. . . . Our Lord began to caress me so much in this way [of prayer] that He vouchsafed to give me the favor of enjoying the *Prayer of Quiet,* and sometimes that of *Union.* . . . True it is, the Prayer of Union continued so short a time that I know not if I could have repeated the *Ave Maria* during it; yet the effects of the prayer which remained were so great, that though I was not yet twenty years old, it seemed to me as if I could trample the whole world under my feet.[17]

During all this time she never dared to pray without a book, "as much afraid to be without a book as to fight against a multitude of people." Sometimes it was enough merely to open the book, again she read a little, or much, waiting the favors the Lord might please to show her.[18]

Having sufficiently recovered, she was taken home. Her pains still continued for three months. Then came the Feast of the Virgin, and her father, believing her desire to confess frequently came from a fear of death which troubled her forbade her to confess. The night following she fell into a trance which continued four days, which she described as a time of insufferable torments.

---

[16] *Ibid.,* 61.
[17] *Ibid.,* 62.
[18] *Ibid.,* 64.

> I had bitten my tongue in several places . . . could not swallow a drop of water without it choking me. It seemed as if I were entirely disjointed, and my head appeared extremely disordered; I was contracted like packthread. . . . No one could touch me in any way, for my whole body was so afflicted, and I could not endure to have it touched. . . . In this state I continued till Easter.[19]

Having arrived at this point she had herself carried back to the monastery, where she remained a cripple for almost three years, giving thanks to God when at last able to get about on all-fours. But she came to endure this with resignation, even with extreme delight. Her conversation of divine things was such as to edify everyone, and they were amazed to see her patience. She took St. Joseph as her saint of particular devotion, through whose intercession great favors were shown her, assisting in all kinds of necessities. As Christ, she explains, was obedient to him on earth who was called his father, "so now in heaven he grants him whatever he asks."[20]

None the less there came a backsliding, during which she passed more than a year fearing to practice mental prayer. Her father fell ill, and she went to nurse him. At his bedside she suffered much, physically, in her conscience, and of grief, in reflecting that, were she to lose him she would lose all joy and comfort, for in him they were placed. Her father died, saying at the end that he wished he had been a religious in the strictest order that existed.

It was soon after her father's death, when she was approaching forty years of age, that what is called her conversion took place. Entering the chapel she was struck at sight of a figure of the wounded Christ, placed temporarily there for an approaching festival. She fell in tears at the feet of this statue, felt every worldly emotion die in her, and fell into a trance. A succession of trances followed, which those in the convent set down as a possession by the devil, accusing her of wishing to appear better than they. She now went to a Jesuit confessor, who put her under, it would appear, the discipline of Loyola's *Exercises*. One day, occupied with her new discipline, she heard a voice saying to her, "Thou shalt have no more converse with men, but with angels."[21] At her prayers she now began to feel Christ near her, and speaking to her. He would walk by her side, without corporeal form, no image, but an interior sentiment of his presence. Other personages were added, St. Peter and St. Paul particularly. Then came visions of the Trinity. "This vision seemed more interior than those preceding; the divine persons were less clearly localized outside herself; it was rather the experience of a presence in the interior of her soul; and at the same time this presence was an understanding of a central mystery of the faith."[22]

---

[19] *Ibid.*, 73.

[20] *Ibid.*, 77.

But to these intellectual visions those of the imagination followed. Christ showed her his hands. "The beauty and whiteness of one of the hands of Jesus Christ alone infinitely surpasses all that we can imagine," she says. Some days later she saw his face. On St. Paul's Day, during the mass, he appeared entire.[23]

The mystic life which began from this period of conversion was still no simple affair. "The ego is renounced, all the former effort disappears in an affluence of passivity,"[24] but there are three clearly marked stages to be gone through. During the first, as Delacroix has analyzed them upon the basis of Teresa's own full and analytic account of her inner life, union with God is sought by different degrees of prayer. In recounting her experience with prayer in its various degrees Teresa uses the similitude of a garden: "He then who commences prayer should imagine that he is beginning to make a garden, for the delight of his Lord, in some very unfruitful soil, full of weeds."[25] The four degrees of prayer which she distinguishes are likened to four different manners in which this garden is watered. The first is by drawing water out of a well, or *mental prayer.* It is laborious, and the searcher seems to do all the work. At times the well is dry. The second degree of prayer she likens to drawing with a wheel and buckets, the *prayer of quiet,* in which the soul is assisted, since now it "begins to be recollected, and to touch upon the supernatural." The third degree of prayer is likened to a little stream, let into the garden to water it. This is called the *prayer of union,* in which God himself takes the office of gardener. The fourth degree of prayer is likened to a good shower of rain. This is the experience of ecstasy, and rapture (the two differentiated by Teresa).

---

[21] *Ibid.,* 219.

[22] Delacroix, *Études d'Histoire et de Psychologie du Mystisme—les Grands Mystiques Chrètien,* 101.

[23] *Autobiography,* 247.

[24] Delacroix, 62.

[25] *Autobiography,* 112.

It might seem that, having gone this long road of prayer, even to the heights of rapture and ecstasy, the mystic way had reached its goal, but such, Teresa testifies, is not the case. She clearly marks, subsequent to this stage, a period of "ecstatic pain," in which thought is concentrated upon the separation of the soul from God, in infinite solitude and distress. Following all the ecstasy and rapture of union, despite visions and comforting words, "the soul has consciousness at once of the presence of God and of itself, of union and obstacle to union; it senses, between God and itself, *life* which refuses itself to the divine, and it longs for death, which alone can make realizable the union which offers and strips itself." [26]

This stage passed, the soul enters finally upon that experience which Tersea calls the *spiritual marriage.* The soul now possesses the divine, not in moments only, but constantly. This consciousness of union spreads itself through all its life. "The soul," says Delacrox, "identified with God, feels itself divine even in its acts. . . . Everything in it appears against a background of plenitude and divine indifference. It has no longer any being, no longer knows itself; the ego is now nothing but the divine activity." [27]

In this final state of blessedness, Teresa gained a new tranquillity. Her physical ills were less constant and severe. Her activity was liberated, her autobiography was written, and it was then that she began to plan a community, intended to be a return to the original austerity of the Carmelite Order. But the foundation of one reforming order so much resembles that of others that it hardly concerns us here to follow her active life, with its difficulties and accomplishments. It is, to be sure, worthy of notice that the great mystics have not been conspicuously lacking in active achievement, but what here most concerns us is to know something of that type of personality whose one passion appears to be "the prosecution of a certain spiritual and intangible quest": the finding of "a way out" or a "way back" to some desirable state in which alone they can satisfy their craving for absolute truth," [28] which, although present in all the centuries of Christianity, as everywhere among the more highly civilized peoples, hardly came to the full flower of self-analysis before the sixteenth century in Spain. We may turn a moment to one whose life was in considerable measure linked with hers, but whose character and experiences had elements quite different; expressed in different symbolism, too intricate however for us to follow here, often in rapturous and beautiful lyric poetry, and generally in a style which makes of him one of the masters of Spanish literature.

---

[26] Delacroix, 66.

[27] *Ibid.,* 67-68.

This person is Juan de Yepez y Alvarez, later as a Carmelite to adopt the name of *John of the Cross.*

John of the Cross was at once a poet and a lover, as was Peter Damiani, but, as we shall soon see, his lover's imagination was more delicate and sensuous than dramatic. Also his experience had none of the passionate extravagance of Teresa; that is to say there is at least little or no evidence that it had, for, despite all that he wrote upon the Mystic Way, he says little which is directly revealing as to his personal struggles. He did, when young, indulge in flagellations beyond the prescription of his rule, apparently,[29] but the more characteristic picture of his austerities is other than such harsh asceticisms.

> At night he remained, more usually, before the very holy Sacrament, and when they begged him take a little rest, he replied: Leave me, my children. Here I find at once my glory and my repose.[30]

His love story was doubtless troubled. There was little in the way of pitfall or pain in the Mystic Way which he appears to have left unsensed; but they were gentle delights which he sought, and not all of them to be postponed until after death. The struggle too was inward—subtle temptations clearly perceived, all in a *dark night* in which it was the end and purpose to put the senses to sleep, and then escape from them while they were unaware.

---

[28] Underhill, *Mysticism,* 3.

[29] "Il se decouvre et inflige à son jeune corps emacié une flagellation autrement dure que les disciplines de regle . . ." Bruno, *Saint Jean de la Croix,* 47.

[30] Hoornaert (quoting a chronicle), Preface to II of his French translation of the *Ascent of Mount Carmel of John of the Cross.*

In a dark night,
With the ardors of a soul inflamed,
Oh! happy destiny!
I have escaped unseen
From my dwelling all peaceful.[31]

Before glimpsing the difficulties met in putting this carnal dwelling to sleep, let us attempt to get from a poem of his own, something of that which made the struggle seem worth its cost—the quality of this mystic experience.

Oh, vivid flame of love,
You pierce, how tenderly,
My soul in its profoundest center!
So, having passed above
Pain, finish entire and presently
Your task, rending the veil of this so sweet encounter.

Oh, soothing burn!
Oh, most delicious wound!
Caressing hand! Oh, delicate caress
Sensed with the texture of eternal life—
Paying its debt in full!
Snuffed my life, and death in life is metamorphosed.

Oh, lamp of fire,
In whose resplendent shining
The deepest caverns of the senses,
Sightless and dark before,
Tingle with beauty's uttermost,
With warmth and with light for the Well-Beloved!

---

[31] Rough translation of first stanza of poem of which the *Ascent of Mount Carmel* is a partial commentary.

How calm! how calmly amorous
Your waking in my breast
Where secretly you dwell alone!
There, in savorous aspirings
Of good and glory full,
You enamor me, and how delightfully![32]

So one whom François de Sales was later to speak of, with a warning, as having gone to the *very summit of the mountain,* describes a moment before which eternal life seems masked but by a thin veil, for the rending of which he prays (*Rompe la tela de este dulce encuentro*). The heaven of Augustine, or of Peter Damiani, the former with its songs and vision of surrounding stars and planets, the latter with its enthroned Virgin, hardly appears. The entire experience, in fulfillment and expectation, is encompassed in a contemplating spirit. For this primarily, or more consciously and persistently, the struggle of purification is undertaken. One is not preparing for some final moment of judgment, as an act of God decreeing heaven or hell, but for the tasting, in various degrees of altitude, of a sublimated ecstatic experience which, at its summit, was heaven, almost.

[32] Oh flama de amor viva,
Que tiernamente hieres
De mi alma en el mas profundo centro!
Pues ya no eras esquiva,
Acaba ya si quieres,
Rompe la tela de este dulce encuentro.

¡Oh cauterio suave!
¡Oh regalada llaga!
¡Oh mano blanda! ¡Oh toque delicado,
Que a vida eterna sabe,
Y toda deuda paga!
Matando, muerte en vida lo has trocado.

¡Oh lamparas de fuego,
En cujos resplandores
Las profundas cavernas del sentido,
Que estaba obscuro y ciego,
Con extraños primores
Calor y luz dan junto a su querido!

¡Cuan manso y amoroso
Recuerdas en mi seno,
Donde secretamente, solo moras;
Y an tu aspirar sabroso
De bien y gloria lleno
Cuan delicadamente me enamoras!

To this leads The Mystic Way. John of the Cross appears to have himself made a chart in pictorial form of this *way.* At the bottom of the picture three roads begin to climb. At the left a road marked, "Road of the Mind (imperfect)"; at the right another: "Road of the Mind (wandering)." The former goes, with many windings, toward heaven to be sure; the latter, also with windings, out of the picture. The center "Path of Perfection" is very narrow at its opening, broadening out, contrary to the others. But the center path goes through "nothing, nothing, nothing, nothing," and still on, "upon this mountain nothing." Beyond a certain point there ceases to be a marked path: "From this point on there is no longer a roadway, since, for the righteous, there is no law." Then there is, as a hedge, the veil separating the summit of the celestial mountain. Faith, Security, Hope are on the outer border of the hedge; just within Charity, and above Divine Silence, and Divine Wisdom; at the very summit "The Perpetual Banquet." [33]

Save for so briefly describing some important features of this rather complicated chart, we cannot here attempt to follow his fuller and more complicated verbal guidebooks.[34] John of the Cross, however, was not merely himself a contemplative mystic. He was a monastic reformer, as was his immediate predecessor and associate, Teresa. He was, as was she, a definer of the mystic attitude which has been described some pages back, and as such burdened with a troublesome task, in which lurked perils from the side of religious authority, and not less subtle perils to the mystic's inner self. We shall later note how conscious the seventeenth century was to become of perils of this latter sort. With the troubling task of keeping this type of mysticism within the path of orthodoxy the sixteenth century was persistently active. Neither Teresa nor John of the Cross entirely escaped the Inquisition. The *illuminated* were always under suspicion. "One gains the impression that it was the mere turn of a card (*Spiel des Zufalls*) which ranged a mystic writer among the heretics or the saints," remarks a recent German historian.

---

[33] A reproduction of this pictorial chart may be found at the beginning of Hoornaert's French translation of *La Montée du Carmel,* I, of the *Oeuvres spirituel du Saint.*

[34] *The Ascent of Mount Carmel, The Dark Night of the Soul,* and *The Living Flame of Love* are the three most important works of John of the Cross setting forth his conception of the Mystic Way. See also, Baruzi, *St. Jean de la Croix et le problèmé de l'expérience mystique.*

> Every Christian is obliged to declare the fact, if he knows, or has heard it said that some person, either dead or living, has affirmed that the sect of the *illuminated* is good; and particularly, if he has said that mental prayer is divinely commanded . . . that the convulsions, tremblings and trances observed among the masters and best disciples of that doctrine are marks of divine love, signs announcing their approval by God, and their possession of the Holy Spirit . . . that, when one arrives at the condition of the *perfect* one envisions, even in this world, the essence of the very holy Trinity; and that such persons have arrived where they are governed by the Holy Spirit immediately, etc., etc.[35]

So, with many omitted items of suspected doctrine, the Inquisition itself, in 1558, summarized the sort of information against the *illuminated* which interested this body. It may be seen, in the light of the above brief reviews of Teresa and John of the Cross how they must always have seemed to hover upon the border of subtle difficulties and distinctions between the permissible and nonpermissible of illumination, from the standpoint of the Church's orthodoxy. But there were other insidious perils which lay in the mystic's path, quite aside from where his visionary experience did or did not fit into the approved scheme of doctrine and discipline.

The mystic quest was a love quest. As such it appears to have engaged all the senses which usually contribute to the fullness of every mundane and fleshly love experience. It was not merely a question, in conquering the flesh, of mastering senses altogether unconnected with a love quest—such grosser desires as those for meat, drink, comfort if not luxury in material surroundings, social approbation. It had indeed always been apparent, since early in the ascetic struggle, that such a conquest was relatively easy, compared to that of subduing temptations which arose, not aside from the ascetic task and contrary to it, but from the very task itself.

---

[35] Llorente, *Histoire Critique de l'Inquisition d'Espagne* (trans. Pellier), xiv, 4, in II, 3-4 quotes in full the ordinance of 1558 concerning the duty of all Christians to inform the Inquisition as to statements or doctrines suspected to be connected with the *illuminated.*

Among these temptations were those founded upon personal vanity in ascetic or visionary accomplishment. The earliest Christian ascetics seem often to have quite frankly attempted to outdo one another in the ostentatious extravagance of their austerities. Long before John of the Cross such temptations had been condemned. But there were still further and more subtle ones a little farther along the path. Contemplatives might, as he tells us, even become a little cross with the Deity for not being as free as they believed he should be in revealing mysteries or granting mystic delights. They might reach and strain after them.[36] Visions too were by no means without danger, he says, particularly if of material content—apparitions of definite form. Such might even be incited by Satan himself. One indeed must rise above, not merely the senses, but even the mind and its forms of thought.

But doubtless the greatest pitfall of all was that of getting, and keeping, the "senses asleep," in the midst of a love experience in which they seemed to claim so intrinsic a part. Peter Damiani's *Book of Gomorrah* is a very primer in comparison with the temptations which John of the Cross discovers in this task. Damiani saw fleshly bestiality, so crude that it might to him seem possible to purge it by some sort of thrashing or direct discipline. John of the Cross gets further into the psychology of the situation—is indeed all the centuries intervening more modern. He recognizes the essential relation of the sexual love-complex to the very mystic quest itself.[37] In the less perfect stages, about the most he seems to believe possible is to bring about that "the soul, by means of the will, may be in lofty union of quietude, while the appetites are actually active in the sensitive parts, at the same time leaving the higher part, which is in prayer, perfectly independent." [38]

---

[36] John of the Cross speaks of those who search only the "suavities" and "savorous and sensible communications" with God, which he calls "spiritual gormandizing." We shall see François de Sales treading at least very near this. (*Montée du Carmel,* II, i, chap. vi.)

[37] "Car souvent, même au cours de leurs exercices spirituels, sans qu'ils puissent s'en defendre, surgissent et se produisent en matière sensuelle, des mouvements et des actes malhonnêtes. Cela arrive parfois même au moment ou l'esprit est recueilli dans l'oraison, même quand on se confesse ou qu'on communie. Comme je viens de le dire, il n'est pas dans leur pouvoir de les empêcher, parceque ces mouvements tiennent à l'une des trois causes que voici.

"La première, c'est très souvent le gout qui porte la nature aux choses spirituelles. En effet cette nature jouit alors selon l'esprit et selon le sens . . . chaque partie de l'être humain prend la satisfaction qui lui est propre. La partie superieure, ou l'esprit . . . dans le gout de Dieu, tandis que la partie inferieure qui est sensuelle, se meut aussi selon son attrait vers la sensualité." (*La Nuit Obscure,* book i, par. 5.)

With such conclusions, no matter how perfectly some few might finally succeed in sublimating this deep difficulty, escaping as it were the body in some dark night when the senses were quietly asleep, the problem of contemplative monasticism was clearly put. It is not strange that, when the following century came, we shall find François de Sales attempting to frame a less strenuous and perilous Mystic Way, and the Church favoring in general active rather than contemplative orders of the religious.

---

[38] *La Montée du Carmel,* book i, chap. xi.

## LIII

When, in the Council of Trent, the Roman Church began to lay down the general principles according to which its future was to be governed; when in Spain, with the assistance of the Inquisition and the Index, wielded in behalf of the Church by a monarchy zealous to keep the religious situation undisturbed, an effective barrier against the Reformation had been erected, the simplest of the remaining problems of Catholicism for the present was the checking of heretical doctrines and tendencies which had begun to manifest themselves in Italy.

The Italians occupied a peculiar position, so far as the Lutheran heresy was concerned. Two men who differed in their way of viewing many other matters might be one in condemning the papal court, as a "standing infamy, and example of all that is most vile and shameful in the world." [1] But to weaken the papal authority was quite another matter. The papacy was in a sense Italy's particular affair, and had for centuries brought power, wealth, and its most conspicuous glory to Italy. The words in which Guicciardini sums up the heresy in Germany are above everything a succinct appraisal of the menace it brought to the influence and glory of the papacy. The "licentious liberty, acquired by the common people in their manner of living," the avarice which had occupied the Church, together with false moves of the troubled Curia which he believed had merely stimulated the discontent, are deplored, it seems as one reads, because they had bred, and had caused to grow, this threatening menace to the Papacy.[2] Patriots who dreamed of a united Italy might see the papal power as an impediment, but such a united Italy was far from universally desired.[3] For most the papacy furnished Italy with something more desirable than political unity: a common interest, and a preeminence in which all Italy might participate, springing out of papal claims to supremacy over the Church of Christendom. Italians looked upon Germans as simple pious people, foolishly tearing things to pieces because of corruption found in them. Such was decidedly not the Italian temper in dealing with religion. Moreover, when the impulse and ideas of the Reformation crossed the Alps into Italy no persistent force kept them alive, or used them politically. "If in Germany," it has been said, "the Reformation was the affair of the princes, and in France of the nobles, in Italy it was embraced principally by the literati." [4] We have noted how it passed through this stage, little more than an element of the humanist movement and the Renaissance, in Germany, in France, even in England, only to grow toward revolutionary significance when it had gone beyond, to effect more practical and immediately vital material interests.

---

[1] So Guicciardini, commenting upon Machiavelli's *Discourses on Livy's Commentaries,* agrees with the latter.

[2] *Storia d'Italia,* book xiii, xv.

[3] Here, for example, Guicciardini differed with Machiavelli.

The most conspicuous circle of such literati in Italy, to be affected by the new religious ideas, was that centered about Vittoria Colonna, the close friend of Michelangelo. Vittoria, in her subtle and graceful sonnets, sighed for "a new love which would arm her, and a new fire which would embrace her soul." Inspired by the Spaniard Valdes, who may perhaps be said to have first spread in Italy the message of Luther, she despaired of being able to "see with the eyes of faith, with what love God has created us, and with what suffering redeemed us," daring to hope no farther than to know by experience "His grace." She enjoyed personal intercourse and correspondence with French princesses whom the Protestant movement had touched, welcomed to her circle most of the intellectual lights who for a time glowed with Lutheran enthusiasm, including several who afterwards definitely allied themselves with Protestantism. It would, however, have been strange to see a member of the Colonna family, the fortunes of which had for centuries been attached to the papacy, definitely in the Protestant fold; and in the end she seems to have feared for those leaders of the new faith who, "the more they thought to save others from shipwreck, the more were in peril of deluge, being themselves outside the ark which gives and assures salvation."[5]

---

[4] Cantu, *La Réforme en Italie et le Concile de Trente,* II, iv (in French trans.).

So there can hardly be said to have been a Reformation in Italy, but there was work there for the Inquisition. Early Lutheran writings had circulated under cover of pseudonyms. The activity of the *Index* was so effective that of one book, said to have circulated to the number of forty thousand copies, not a single exemplar is known, while the works of another very prolific writer who, after gaining high honors in the Church ended his days a Protestant, are said to be very rare. So great was the zeal of the Inquisition, in fact, that on the death of an unpopular pope, in 1559, public rioters wrecked the palace in which the Holy Office centered its Italian activities.

Italy was therefore, as well as Spain, territory definitely gained, just as England was definitely lost. As for Germany, a large portion was still to remain a field of contention; as well as France, where the nation could not be called definitely Catholic before the last quarter of the sixteenth century.

In all those countries where there was still ground to maintain or regain, there was one common defensive explanation of Protestant heresy and schism. This was to cry *mea culpa,* declaring the whole movement a punishment of God, justly brought upon the Church by reason of its sins and irregularities.

Il ne faut s'étonner, Chrétiens, si la nacelle
Du bon pasteur saint Pierre en ce monde chancelle.
Las! des Lutheriens la cause est très mauvaise,
Et la defendent bien, et par malheur fatal
La notre est bonne et saints, et la defendons mal.[6]

The French poet Ronsard indeed points the finger less directly than a French cardinal before the Council of Trent, who accuses himself and his fellow bishops: "Because of us the tempest and the thunderbolts have come."

---

[5] Letter to the Cardinal Cervini, 1542 (in Cantu, II, 174).

[6] "Christians should not be astonished if the barque of the good shepherd St. Peter totters in this world. Alas! the Lutheran cause is bad indeed, but they defend it well; while, fatal misfortune! our cause is good and holy and we defend it poorly."

Such penitential self-accusations were a call to strengthen old institutions by a better example of conduct on the part of those who represented them. Conditions were bad enough, in France and in Germany not to speak of elsewhere, to warrant such interpretation of the unfortunate turn of affairs. Enough has been said of them in considering the Reformation to make repetition here unnecessary. But widespread moral reform was no simple matter. Ecclesiastical evils were deeply intrenched, and brooked reforming bridles with little patience. The Jesuit Canasius, making a survey of Germany, perceived this, and reported to his general:

> Very few physicians are competent to cure such diseases; very few may flatter themselves as being clever enough to obtain from them (bishops and archibishops) more regular conduct. The conducting of the consciences of prelates constitutes a grave peril for our Company; there is more harm than good to be drawn from such a ministry. If our fathers require of their penitents what they should demand, they will make themselves detested." [7]

Protestantism had, to be sure, begun but it had not continued solely to criticize the consistency of clerical behavior. It had gone on to criticize the consistency and legitimacy of the very institutions themselves. But it was impossible for Catholicism even to start where the Protestants had started, and set themselves solely upon a basis of moral reform. There must be found other means of establishing, or reëstablishing prestige, more practicable and palatable; means indeed which made it possible for Jesuit fathers, despite the warning of Canasius, to become, as they soon did become, the spiritual advisers of bishops and archbishops.[8]

There were reforms of procedure to be sure, even in the Curia itself. As late as the papacy of Leo X, who died in 1521, absolutions and dispensations might be purchased at Rome on a fixed scale of prices:

> A dispensation of five years duration, for one person or several (which may cover a man, his wife and their children, but not children either of them may have had by another marriage) 20 bolendini.

---

[7] Janssen, *L'Allemagne et la Réforme,* V, 206.

[8] Janssen, V, 218.

> An absolution for one who has received all the sacred orders before reaching twenty-five years, and is not legitimately *in orders,* 7 groschen.
>
> A dispensation for one who asks to receive, immediately on reaching twenty years of age, all the sacred orders, 33 groschen, etc., etc.[9]

Dealings with the papal court became more complicated, and those who wished dispensations and absolutions needed guidance and a go-between. One who wished to gain some favor there should know, if for example he were French "That an envoy left Paris each Monday before midnight, and that the causes sent are ordinarily received in eighteen days."[10] It was also well to know that the promptest, but also the most expensive way to get action in matters of acquiring ecclesiastical benefits was that "called secret," which might be consummated in eight days, with the signature of the pope. Next was by way of the Chamber, more expensive but also more prompt than the following ways, because here there was less formality. Then came the Chancery. The least expensive way was by the Consistory, not to be sure so prompt as the others, but less expensive.[11] It might further prove convenient to know that the pope, and he only, might give permission to one who had enjoyed a pension from religious property, to retain the pension even though he subsequently married: as proven by the case of a certain Count de Marsan against the Bishop of Cahors, in a case involving the considerable income of ten thousand livres:[12] and that likewise only the Pope might, by dispensation, allow a person under age, of illegitimate birth, crippled, an absolved heretic, or one who had killed another in self-defense or without intention, or had committed simony, to receive the sacred orders, without being accorded which some benefice could not pass to him.[13]

Loose living in monastic communities also could hardly be eliminated so long as they might give the right of sanctuary to some affluent criminal, ready to pay with an endowment for such refuge from the civil law; or while impecunious noble families, with daughters whom they had no money to dower properly and marry off, continued to shunt off the responsibility of caring for them single upon some nunnery, which, for a small consideration, was ready to leave aside the question of serious vocation for a cloistered life.[14]

---

[9] "Taxes de la Penitencerie Apostolique—après l'Édition publiée à Paris en 1520," reprint, Paris, 1879.

[10] From a book published in 1699 (the eighth edition), entitled: "Instruction Très Facile et Necessaire pour obtenir de Cour de Rome et de la Legation d'Avignon, toutes sortes d'Expeditions de Benefices, Dispenses de Marriages et autres, les scavoir lire, leur prix, les mettre à execution, et de qui on est obligé de se servir pour les obtenir; avec plusieurs modèles d'Actes et copies de Signatures, de Brefs, et de Bulles, etc." Dedicated to the Archbishop of Paris, published with permission of the king, on the basis of a decree of *Parlement* of 1653.

[11] *Ibid.,* 195ff.

[12] *Ibid.,* 79ff.

[13] *Ibid.,* chap. I, entire.

In short, the Church which aimed to keep alive the traditional institutions of the medieval period without sacrifice of any of the material advantages, was in a very embarrassing position in any attempts to eliminate, just where and when it would, pecuniary and other social advantages attached to these institutions. As Canasius had suggested, one who attempted seriously to eliminate such evils could not hope to proceed far with any more solid result than that of getting himself detested.

But if the problem of reforming ecclesiastical abuses was as difficult of solution in the last quarter of the sixteenth century as it had been in the first quarter of the fifteenth, when the Council of Constance assembled with many good resolutions, there was a way of treading softly and accomplishing many things. There was also a body of men who, having learned just how much and how little might be accomplished by giving an example of apostolic zeal and purity, were patient and pliable, ready to take a little where much was a vain aspiration, and apt to change their methods to suit circumstances. In their action there was something "of the silent incessant activity of natural forces. Without passion, with no cry of war, without agitation or inconsiderate zeal" [15] they pressed steadily, circumspectly, seldom obliged to retrace their steps. To make an influential enemy by open denunciation was enough to bring public rebuke and discipline even upon the most influential among them.[16] In general they avoided fixed posts of prominence, such as those of bishops and archbishops. Such prelates were in the meshes of a net, into which one was almost obliged either to settle comfortably, or at least to break violently and noisily some strands.

---

[14] See chaps. v and vi; Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy,* VI.

[15] Quoted by Janssen from Paulsen, *L'Allemagne et la Réforme,* V, 208, note.

[16] This was the fate of Bobadilla, at the very top of the Jesuit ladder in its early years, when he publicly denounced the compromising *Interim* of Charles V, which decreed that Protestantism and Catholicism were to be left as they were, pending the action of the Council of Trent.

This body of men was the Jesuit Company, described by their founder as the *scouts* of the Roman Church, who "in alarms and surprises, by day and by night, should be ready unceasingly to conquer or to die"; attacking, defending, according to circumstances, and holding the enemy everywhere in uncertain suspense.[17] They might scatter after a forlorn hope in England, disguised as sailors, merchants or packmen; they might serve equally well in Germany or France, where, as we shall see, different situations called for rather different policies. It takes, to be sure, something more solid than the best-organized scouts to win a long campaign, but they may show the way to points of vantage, skirmish for and hold them. Something broader and deeper, in the working out of forces in European history and psychology, was to set Roman Catholicism on its pins in the new world of divided Christendom; but if one look with shorter vision, their service to the cause of the Counter Reformation was hardly less than astounding.

Also, it might be added, the line between the scout and the spy is sometimes finely drawn. Scouts must at times wear the uniform and talk the language of the enemy. It is not necessary here to recount or weigh the mass of controverted abuse which began soon to be broadcasted against the company. Criticism and abuse is easily found, and few things are more difficult to discover or judiciously balance than the vices and virtues of the Jesuit Company. Two things at least are certain: the path they attempted to tread was slippery almost everywhere, and they did succeed in winning, both within and without the Church, enemies in every country they entered.

The earliest activities of the Jesuits against the forces of the Reformation was, naturally, in Germany. In the second quarter of the sixteenth century they began an energetic attempt to stem the Protestant tide. Earliest of these Jesuit apostles in Germany was Peter Faber, who had begun life as a shepherd boy among the hills of Savoy, and was the gentlest and most docile of the first six companions of Loyola. It became almost immediately his policy to aim at the restoration of Catholic practices, and the correction of vices, "before saying a single word about doctrine." Also, like another Savoyard a half century later,[18] he believed in encouraging people to believe themselves capable, with the assistance of God, "not only to accomplish all that God and the Church required, but even things much more difficult."[19] Faber was a born missionary, whose life was exemplary, and whose nature was sweet and gently persuasive. Le Jay and Bobadilla followed him, the one an intellectual, the other a brave and fiery zealot. All three attributed their success, beyond anything else, to the influence of the *Exercises* of Loyola.

---

[17] Crétineau-Joly, *Jesuites* . . ., I, 279ff.

After them came Canasius with his catechisms, "the gentle friend of little children."[20] He taught all ages, from children to old people. To *know your Canasius* came to be the common way of saying that one knew his catechism.

The *Spiritual Exercises* and the catechisms of various grades could not, however, hold and fill the entire intellectual interest of students old or young. Very early in its history the company began to formulate an educational program. This program was to be broader than the traditional program of medieval education. Literature, pagan as well as Christian, history, eloquence, poetry, all the arts and sciences were included, remembering always that in these studies nothing was to be sought after other than the glory of God and the good of souls.[21]

It was apparently Le Jay who first realized the opportunity of his company in the field of education in Germany. The unsettled conditions of life and thought brought about by the troubled currents of the Reformation had disrupted the education which had undergone a revival in the fifteenth century. Attendance at the universities had been greatly reduced, secondary education was in a chaotic situation, and necessarily so, since all education had been mixed up with theology and the Church. Le Jay left Germany with the plan of a "College of the Germans" to be founded in Rome. In 1552 thirty-two cardinals contributed to the endowment of such a college, in which promising German students were fed gratuitously with the "milk of science . . . to confound sectarian dialectic," and sent back to Germany, with all the prestige of having learned what they taught and preached at its immediate Roman source.[22] With more generous endowments from Gregory XIII its work was later expanded, and a goodly sprinkling of the scions of important families of the Empire were sent to be educated there.[23] Protestant writers were soon testifying to the success of these graduates of the *College of the Germans* in combating the reformed faiths.

---

[18] François de Sales.

[19] Janssen, *L'Allemagne et la Réforme,* IV, 398.

[20] *Ibid.,* IV, 402.

[21] For the Jesuit "ratio studiorum," of which Francis Bacon said that, in his time, "nothing better had been put in practice," see Crétineau-Joly, IV, 183ff.

> The German College in Rome is a hotbed singularly favorable for developing the worst kind of Jesuitry. Our young Germans are educated there gratuitously, and at the end of their studies are sent home to restore papistry to its former place, and to fight for it with all their might. You find them exercising their ministry in a great number of collegiate churches and parishes. They become the advisers of bishops and even archbishops, and we see these Jesuits under our very eyes defending the Catholic cause with such zeal that we Evangelicals may well ask ourselves in what lands and in what towns such fervent zeal for the beloved gospel is found among our own party. They seduce so many souls from us that it is distressing even to enumerate them.[24]

The situation was, however, far from favorable during the early part of this campaign. Bobadilla, as already noted, angered Charles V by attacking the *Interim,* and although Ferdinand, his brother and King of Austria, expressed disapproval at the rapid spread of Protestantism in his realm toward the middle of the sixteenth century,[25] by 1560 he had concluded it was wise to make concessions to the new ideas, allowing communion in the two elements, marriage of the clergy, and suppressing the laws concerning fasting. Four years later, when he came to die, he appeared to regret such compromises, and in his Testament expressed further a fear lest his son and heir "abjure the true faith to pass over to the new sects."[26]

---

[22] Crétineau-Joly, I, 358.

[23] Crétineau-Joly gives an imposing list: I, 358-359.

[24] Quoted from a Protestant sermon (1594) by Campbell, *The Jesuits,* 66.

[25] "Each year the number of Evangelicals grows in all classes of society. People have a thousand sorts of reasons of sympathy for a religion which authorizes them to lay hands upon the property of churches and convents, etc." Janssen, *Ferdinand to the Franciscan Egenolf,* IV, 101.

Maximilian II, the uncertainty of whose faith bothered his father upon his deathbed, came to rule not only as King of Austria but as Emperor as well, and his position with respect to the new religious faith was even more equivocal than that of his father had been. Even to the last his personal belief was uncertain. "In his last moments as during his entire life" it was impossible for anyone" to know whether he was Catholic or Confessionalist (Protestant)."[7]

During the reign of Maximilian II, in many of the Germanic regions of the Empire, people forgot the old religious services, parish property was disseminated by looting and disappeared. For some years previous to 1575 the episcopal see of Vienna was allowed to remain vacant. An imperial edict allowed the practice of the Protestant cult in the castles and upon the domains of nobles of the Empire who were of Lutheran persuasion. In short the Reformation bid fair to conquer even Austria, the original stronghold of Hapsburg power.

With the death of Maximilian, however, there came a change. The new king and emperor, Rudolph II, had little taste for or experience in public affairs, and was therefore bound to rely largely upon his advisers, and he soon evinced a tendency to surround himself "only with papists."[28] The year following his accession he spent largely in Austria,[29] where he immediately took steps to stop the spread of religious liberty, from the dominions of the nobles to the towns. Protestant preachers were obliged to quit Vienna on twenty-four hours notice, and the country entire in two weeks.[30]

[26] Janssen, IV, 111, 449-450.

[27] Janssen, IV, 499.

[28] Janssen, IV, 500. Rudolph was an accomplished dilettante of broad culture, with a pronounced streak of melancholy which first closed him off from all the activities of rule, and which ended in insanity.

[29] Rudolph's adolescence had been spent in Spain.

[30] *Cambridge Modern History,* III, 701.

The accession of Rudolph came at an opportune moment. Three years previously a pope had been chosen whose heart was "truly German," and by nothing so much grieved and occupied as by the Protestant schism. A new congregation was formed, of nine cardinals, to attend exclusively to German affairs. Several papal representatives were sent to strategic points, and Father Canasius entered Germany with his catechisms. Far and wide, where opportunity offered, schools were established for all grades of students, from childhood to university age, in which education was offered free to many. Even Protestant parents were glad to avail themselves of these opportunities. "The Jesuits," a Protestant divine complains toward the end of the century, "because they understand how to inspire in them a taste for literature and the arts, seduce deplorably our children." [31] Here, for the first time in centuries, an institution undertook on a broad scale neither to force, nor even persuade, but predominantly to *win* conversion.

Force was by no means left out as an instrument of restoring the Catholic faith and practices. The Hapsburgs, by the end of the sixteenth century, after decades of straddling, were definitely committed to the side of Catholicism, and by 1602 it had been practically restored in Austria. This was by no means the whole of the reconquest of Germany by Roman Catholicism, to which the quarrels of Protestant sects contributed almost as much as the steady, consistent, and single-minded efforts of the Counter Reformation.

> Luterisch, päpstitsch und calvinisch,
> Diese Glauben alle drei
> Sind vorhanden, doch ist Zweifel
> Wo das Christenthum denn sei." [32]

But the contest was not merely three-sided, between Lutherans, Roman Catholics, and the Reformed Religion of Zwingli and Calvin. There was always the radical Anabaptist wing, and minor theological differences, thundered with argument and abuse from pulpits of every shade of Protestant belief, sowed strife among congregations and split the unity of the Middle Class.

---

[31] Janssen, V, 209.

[32] "We have three sorts of faith, Lutheranism, Papalism, and Calvinism, and still there is doubt as to where to find Christianity"—so may be freely translated a popular proverb of the time.

Then the attempt to enforce Roman Catholicism in Bohemia loosed the long and destructive struggle of the Thirty Years War, which was to mean further loss of geographical territory to Protestantism in Germany. At its beginning some three-quarters of Germany, despite encroachments, remained in some sense Protestant; at its end, not only was Austria definitely lost, but quite a third of the rest of Germanic Europe.[38]

But the full religious effect of this war could not even so be measured. While armies and armed bands fought and trekked from land to land, living upon the country and its inhabitants as they went like a blight of grasshoppers or ants, the principle was broadly established that the religion of the prince was to be the religion of his people; and of such princes and principalities there were to be some three hundred and sixty-odd. This solution was indeed made simpler by the almost total destruction of religious life and habits outside of the larger towns. This condition is amusingly illustrated by a passage from the most interesting piece of literature which the Thirty Years War produced: the romance *Simplicius Simplicissimus,* written by one who had been carried off from his home, as a lad of ten, by one of the pillaging bands of soldiers, to serve as page and soldier, traversing all Germany, during this war. The dialogue is between the hero, *Simplicius Simplicissimus,* and a hermit, who has drawn the boy from his hiding place, the boy's home having just been sacked and burned.

HERMIT: What's your name?

SIMPLICIUS: Boy.

HERMIT: Oh, I see you're not a girl, but what was it your father and mother called you?

SIMPLICIUS: I didn't have any father and mother.

HERMIT: But who gave you that shirt?

SIMPLICIUS: Oh, ma mudder.

HERMIT: And what did your mudder call you?

SIMPLICIUS: She called me boy, and rogue, long-eared donkey, belching-bumpkin, stupid-ass, and gallows-bird.

HERMIT: And who was your mother's husband?

---

[38] I have here qualified slightly a statement of Hettner, *Literaturgeschicte des achtzehnten Yahrhunderts,* III, i, 15.

SIMPLICIUS: Nobody.
HERMIT: But who did your mother sleep with at night?
SIMPLICIUS: With my pap.
HERMIT: And what did your pap call you?
SIMPLICIUS: He called me boy too.
HERMIT: And what was his name?
SIMPLICIUS: Pap.
HERMIT: What did your mother call him?
SIMPLICIUS: Pap—and sometimes master.
HERMIT: Never anything else?
SIMPLICIUS: Yep, sometimes.
HERMIT: What then?
SIMPLICIUS: Bumpkin, dirty good-for-nothing, fat-hog, old-dung-heap, and a lot of other things when she quarreled.
HERMIT: Do you know the *Our Father?*

[The reply is an untranslatable garble of the Lord's Prayer, following which comes a confusion playing about the words *Kirchen* (church) and *Kirschen* (cherries). Then the HERMIT asks again— Don't you know anything about our Lord, God?]

SIMPLICIUS: Oh, yes, he's at home, on our kitchen door, on the holy-board. Ma mudder brought him home from the kermiss and stuck him there.

The Thirty Years War did not, however, eliminate all the effects of the preceding activities of the Jesuit Company. Ravage, bloodshed, and disorder might sweep the land almost clean of every vestige of preceding civilization, leaving conditions of which the marks had not all been eliminated a century later, but the Jesuits had accumulated more permanent knowledge and experience; for what the Company learned it did not forget, and what no longer served in one place, might be adapted to serve later elsewhere. Entering Germany with such zeal as every new religious organization has, its missionary effort distinguished by piety, benevolence, and energy, with no particular tool save its organization, its *Spiritual Exercises,* and its catechisms, it left Germany with tried knowledge as to what education which subordinated all other aims to that of propagating the faith of the Council of Trent might accomplish, by taking the unformed young, and shaping them with a culture broad, agreeable, and safe from the standpoint of an authoritative religious institution. From the Jesuits the Roman Catholic Church learned, and also has never forgotten, that it is wiser to keep the education of its children in its own hands, lest other educational ends obscure that of the *greater glory of God.*[34]

Before the Reformation education had never been, for the Church, a problem at all. Education, of young and more mature, had fallen naturally into its hands; and taking, in its entire breadth, the period during which the Church had naturally occupied this rôle, only a distorted historical perspective can see her as warping education in any other sense than that in which the dominant type of thought in any era seizes upon the authoritative centers of teaching, and exerts pressure against what seems new, and therefore threatening. But the Reformation had done something more than present merely a religious alternative. Such once clearly existing, thought, given the privilege of choosing between the two, might, in the very fact of being left to choose, judge both, and perhaps accept neither. In sum, a new freedom was inevitably given the intelligence in its critical and reflective activity; and with this came a new sort of intellectual curiosity, presenting a new educational problem. From the standpoint of the Roman Church that emerged, with a rather clear and definite plan of its future from the Council of Trent, this problem was that of plotting a path for this liberated intellectual activity, in which, while avoiding certain questions, as settled or left in the hands of that Church for settlement, it might be given as broad and as informing a range as seemed consistent with the safeguard of the Church's doctrine and institutional power. Indeed this freeing of the intellect, within prudent boundary lines, was the crowning task of the Counter Reformation, for which a large part of the initial experimentation was done in the closing years of the sixteenth century, in Germany, and by the Jesuit Company.

The initial task of the Counter Reformation, and of the Jesuits, in France was quite different from what it had been in Germany.

---

[34] Speaking of Jesuit scientists Father Campbell (*The Jesuits,* 377) writes, "These eminent men were not seeking primarily distinction, or aiming at success in the sciences to which they devoted themselves. . . . The glory they achieved was sought exclusively to enable them more easily to reach the souls of men."

Hardly installed as an educational body, and far from welcomed by the highest educational authorities, the increasing bitterness of the religious wars, and the increasing complexity of the religious situation, plunged the Company into political activities. These political activities, as we have noted in following to its ultimate conclusion the religious struggle of the sixteenth century, were a failure. In order to understand how difficult it would have been for them to be ultimately anything but a failure, we may turn more directly than has yet been done, for some moments, to the old struggle between Gallicanism and Ultramontanism, between national and papal Catholicism, in France.

The tradition of some degree of independence with respect to Rome was very old in France. It might trace its roots to the time of Charlemagne, but in the tenth century, when papal power had already developed far more definiteness than in Charlemagne's time, this Gallicanism was clearly enunciated. Gerbert, though himself afterwards a pope, had made definite contribution to the tradition. A pope had crowned Charlemagne as Emperor; but the kings of France were crowned, from the eighth century, by the highest national prelate of France, the Archbishop of Rheims. The sacrosanct *ideal* of French monarchy, which antedated in France any very effective or widespread monarchical power, rested in this anointing, at the hands of the head of the Church in France. We need not here trace the outcroppings of this tradition, which even the moments of highest papal prestige never entirely obscured. The important matter is rather to note that, in France, the weakening of papal prestige, following the Avignon period, left still a traditional basis of religious unity for France, as Catholic. What had disturbed this basis was, not so much the papal weakness, as the fact that what the pope had lost, the monarch, and not the national Church, had gained. And so, when later in the religious wars the efforts of the League seemed bent upon joining pope and king, every show of foreign influence awakened the old Gallicanism of France.

As for Catherine de Medici, she had taken pains to keep clear of foreign influence, though sadly tempted for a season. To the efforts of the Council of Trent, when once she realized that it was to do nothing toward settling Protestant difficulties, she had remained lukewarm. Its results hardly satisfied her: "I fear our council will be nothing but a blooming to which neither fruit nor betterment will follow." Her son, Charles IX, wrote to his ambassadors at the council still more definitely: "From what I gather from your letters, the Fathers wish to gnaw away the claws of the kings and elongate their own, which I cannot allow." [35] When the decrees of the council were finally sent for approval, Catherine temporized, while the Pope, to circumvent her, himself had the decrees printed and distributed. Such were the factors working against Jesuit success in France during the sixteenth century. But, strangely enough, with peace once established, the Jesuits were back again—even with the king's approval, when they had been suspected by some of inciting his assassination.

It was their educational program which brought them back. In 1603, answering a protest against their return to France, Henry IV wrote to the *Parlement de Paris:*

> If the Sorbonne condemned them [the Jesuit teachers], it is without knowing them. The University has reason to regret that in their absence it has been deserted, and the scholars, in spite of all your prohibitions, have gone in search of them both in and out of my realm.[36]

Through the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries they educated a very large proportion of France's most eminent men in every class and profession: Descartes, Corneille, Molière, Diderot, Marmontel, J. J. Rousseau, to mention but some few names among the men of letters.[37]

---

[35] Rocquain, *La France et Rome pendant les Guerres de Religions,* 43-48.

[36] De Vaissière, *Henri IV,* 499ff., gives this letter entire.

[37] A certain Jesuit, Father Coton, made something of a personal conquest of Henry IV, which the Gallicans accused him of accomplishing with sorcery, as possessor of a mirror in which he read and recounted to the King all the secrets of foreign courts, or all domestic intrigues against him. Still Henry remained suspicious ("Il entend bien les surveiller de près au moment même ou il les embrasse." Bremond, *Histoire Literaire du Sentiment Religieux en France,* II, 86. "Timentibus leo, audentibus lepus," Richelieu penned upon the margin of a memoire concerning them, D'Avenel, *Richelieu et la monarchie absolue,* III, 347. In his own works he wrote, "On ne saurait commêtre l'entière education des jeunes gens au Jesuites, sans s'Exposer à leur donner une puissance d'autant plus suspect aux états." *Oeuvres* (ed. Gaucheron), 184.

But here, as so often in the history of the Jesuit Company, while succeeding effectively for the moment, in the end they failed. It is necessary to but run over the above names to note how their most brilliant pupils were like to slip their leading strings. Moreover, though unable to touch politics anywhere during the rule of Richelieu, who admired them as educators, but mistrusted thoroughly their political intentions,[38] when toward the end of the reign of Louis XIV they succeeded in bringing to bear effective influence, it was but to prepare the movement which again brought banishment upon them, and, as we shall see, before the eighteenth century closed, a temporary dissolution of the order by papal decree.

More and more, as time went on, the influence of the company was to be limited to effecting minor tactical victories. Even in the seventeenth century its most important influence was upon the prevalent caste of religious life, where it was but one of many converging influences in the general current, some characteristics of which we shall later note. A creature of the first half of the sixteenth century, and active through this century everywhere, even outside of Europe, the eighteenth century brought to the fore influences against which its arsenal was largely of negative effectiveness. It was little either the fault or the virtue of the organization that the European world, even the Roman Church when it had assimilated all from the company that was permanently useful, left it behind; nor that, as time went on, it was less and less able to attract better than mediocre personalities. Like all such organizations, the Jesuits were best at the beginning, degenerating both in ideal and practice. Many of the faults with which it is charged were too common in the century in which the company arose for us to judge them justly. If it clung to some of these faults after the conscience of Europe had outgrown them, it is well to remember that the patchwork of European politics is less rigid and consistent than the constitution of the Company of Jesus; and also that this company is not the only organization which has found it difficult to maintain moral equilibrium when armed with weapons of divinity. In fact the organization lived on, lives on, beyond the period of its usefulness, hardly longer even feared; a flytrap with the intricacy of a modern printing press. No amount of adaptability can preserve in the foreground of important affairs an institution which continues to serve a cause itself pushed from the forefront of the battle of civilization. Even the suavity which was so prominent an external characteristic of Jesuit influence, was less noticeable, as more and more it came to be a common characteristic of the religious physiognomy of Roman Catholic Europe.

---

[38] Schimberg, *L'Education Morale dans les Collèges de Jésus en France,* XVI, XVII, XVIII Siècles. 291 gives fuller list. Also, D'Avenel, *Richelieu et la monarchie absolve.*

# BOOK IX

# THE ORDERING OF DIVIDED CHRISTIANITY

# LIV

The fairest, most agreeable, and the most necessary of all our subjects of knowledge is without doubt the knowledge of ourselves. The science of humanity is of all the sciences the one most worthy of men. None the less this science is neither the most cherished nor the most accomplished science we have. . . . The majority of those who pass for clever at many things, understand but vaguely the essential differences there is between the soul and the body . . . not at all clearly enough perceived . . . before the last few years.[1]

Christianity . . . no longer consists in being spiritually minded, *i.e.,* in enmity to the world. Instead of this it now requires that man, while living altogether in the world, should also live an inner and altogether spiritual life.[2]

THE above quotations, abstracted, one from the work of a seventeenth-century philosopher, also a Roman cleric, the other from a nineteenth-century historian of philosophy in introducing the beginning of what is called *modern philosophy,* suggest that in the seventeenth century, both religion and philosophy undertook the acrobatic task of riding two horses. In the sphere of religion we may take Europe to be, from the beginning of this period, definitely divided between Roman Catholics and Protestants. Catholics and Protestants did not attempt this task in precisely the same way, and their religious histories fall in a sense apart; but the philosophical world knew no such clear division. Moreover the general atmosphere of life knew no such clear division. However, even in the acrobatic task above suggested, religion and life were separated in a sense that the Middle Ages had never intended to separate them. Religious tolerance was in no essential sense implied by this separation, but in it the premise of religious toleration was bound to be in the end clearly pushed toward the consciousness of larger numbers of people. Also there was something else which pushed, though by no means single-mindedly nor clearly, toward toleration. This was a rather widespread desire for surcease from religious strife, and the establishment of orderly and peaceful social conditions. Finally, and underneath everything else, there came a new philosophical orientation. One of the horses which this new philosophy attempted to ride was decidedly and profoundly religious; the other was, quite as decidedly and profoundly, not antireligious, but merely another horse. However, even the religious horse rested no longer, in this new philosophy, on premises believed or designed to explain, complete, or harmonize with a system of religious dogma. Here again new possibilities for the spread of religious tolerance were latent.

---

[1] Malebranche, *De la Recherche de la Vérité,* Preface.

[2] Erdmann, *History of Philosophy—Modern,* Introduction, sec. 258 in Eng. trans.

But, deeper than any other interest of this new philosophy, was that in the world order, the Universe as a rational unity, which did not so much signify God in a symbolic way as move according to his bidding. In this attempt to harmonize the motions of the universe, there were two poles of farthest separation: the courses of the heavenly bodies, and the actions of men. The most profound problem of this period was that of establishing these so apparently different sorts of motion under a single, or harmoniously operating, law and principle: this was indeed the fundamental difficulty inherent in the task of living, as the second of our above-quoted passages suggests, "an inner and altogether spiritual life," which is at the same time "altogether in the world."

It may thus be seen that, in order to comprehend at all the religious life of the era immediately before us, some degree of philosophical orientation is indispensable.

Occasionally, in the course of history, the act of an individual, a little like a bolt from the blue, cuts sharp the current of thought and events, consolidates still fluid and orderless tendencies which may afterwards appear as prophetic of change, lops off agitating cilia of old ideas and habits which have begun to grow, apprehensively, a defensive shell, and some portion of the world becomes, almost suddenly, new in many important aspects. Something of this sort happened when Constantine and his colleague published the Edict of Milan, granting tolerance to Christians; when Luther nailed his theses to the church door in Wittenberg. But there are few changes more sharply marked than that which initiated modern philosophy, with the publication of a little work of some sixty printed pages: the *Discours de la Méthode* of René Descartes.

Scholasticism, where it was not hardening into a defensive theological armor,[3] trailed off into such easy methods of "answering all questions, once given knowledge of the thing indicated by the name given it," as the *Ars Brevis* of Raymond Lully.[4] The new Renaissance thought, rejoicing with Shakespeare to discover "how beauteous mankind is," intoxicated with new knowledge, was ready to do battle with the *Signs of the Zodiac,*[5] and to refer many miracles vulgarly attributed to demons to the spiritual powers of men.[6] It was left for the seventeenth century, and the method and attitude enunciated by Descartes, to temper this enthusiasm with criticism; to simplify under a few physical principles a growing mass of knowledge, some gathered hit-or-miss, some by controlled investigation; and to bind together "mutation, variety, vicissitude, transition, change, motion,"[7] in some rational order.

Leaving aside all worshipful attitude toward him, Descartes none the less goes to the human individual for the ultimate basis of certainty. I may doubt, he says, everything else, but can scarcely doubt the fact that I doubt. When I doubt, I *think,* and because I think, I am—"*Je pense, donc je suis.*" This fundamental proposition, founded in the very source of skepticism, he believed safe from the most unsettling suppositions of skeptics. Such a principle is, to be sure, but formal, and gets us perhaps less far than Descartes imagined. But we are less interested in his definite system of thought than in its temper, and in the influence which outlasted the system. Descartes perceived, as Augustine had but with more precise and critical vision, the significance of active human psychology. "The diversity of our opinions," he writes, "does not proceed from the fact that some are more reasonable than others, but derives solely from the fact that we conduct our thought by diverse paths, and do not consider the same thing." [8]

---

[3] "The sixteenth century witnessed a remarkable restoration of Scholastic philosophy and theology. The theological movement, which was the important one, issued from reaction against the Reformation." (De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy,* 491.)

[4] *Ars Brevis,* Prologue.

[5] Bruno, *Spaccio della Bestia Trionfante.*

[6] Pietro Pomponazzi, *Les Causes des Merveilles de la Nature, ou les Enchantements.* See also page 62 in Intro. to French trans., Busson.

[7] Bruno, *Spaccio della Bestia Trionfante.*

Such an observation is an excellent guide of critical efficacy, but another went still further, noting the constructive significance of individual human activity:

> I was in Germany, where the occasion of the wars, as yet not finished, had called me . . . not finding any conversation to divert me, having furthermore, luckily, no cares nor passions to trouble me, I remained shut up day after day in a cubbyhole, where I had perfect leisure to entertain myself with my own thoughts. Among the first of these, I set myself to consider that often there is less perfection in works composed of many portions, made by different hands, than in those which a single person has formed. So one observes that buildings undertaken and finished by a single architect are usually more beautiful and harmonious than those which several persons have undertaken to refashion, using old walls originally built to serve otherwise.[9]

A simple observation certainly! And when he goes on to amplify this reflection, referring it to cities as a whole, begun as little walled towns, growing gradually to great cities, big and little houses pellmell, one beside the other, placed so disorderly that streets are curved and irregular, one realizes how the material for such observation lay all about, for anyone to note—lies about in almost any European city to-day. Hardly philosophy this! But yes; a conception which was to turn speculating minds in a new direction. For him it meant, first of all, a determination to rebuild his own thought upon a foundation all its own,[10] rejecting walls, boundary lines, and broken stone of old intellectual edifices tendered him in the process of his education. But it had still further significance. It recognized with a new clarity the fact that not only God, but human activity, when left free, created unified and har-

[8] *Discours de la Méthode,* IV Partie, beginning of Dialogue I.

[9] *Ibid.,* Part II.

[10] *Ibid.*

monious forms. Here, to the Renaissance discovery of the efficacy of actions, as illustrated largely in disorder and struggle and clash, is added and emphasized an innate faculty of human *reason* to create order.

This ordering activity of human reason was but one side of his thought. The mind, he says, knows itself, and its own activity, better than it can know any other thing. But what of outside material objects, and agglomerations of objects, perceived, apparently existing, moving, changing, quite independent of thought activity of our own? As thinking beings we have the possibility of knowing something about our thinking minds; but how about matter? What do we know about it, and what can we do with it?

This was a very puzzling problem from Descartes' point of view, and into it we need not follow him far. With some of the qualities of matter, he feels certainly, our mind has something to do, since people can disagree about these qualities, and perceive them differently. With one quality, however, he firmly believes, the mind had nothing to do. This is the quality by virtue of which an object occupies exclusively a certain definite portion of space (*extension,* he calls this quality). And something too can be done with matter, independent of our minds: *it can be moved*—it does not always occupy the same portion of space.

And so it seemed that our sole certainty with respect to matter was reduced to its possession of qualities with which our minds had nothing significant to do. Such a conclusion might have seemed troubling to an architect, setting about erecting, according to Descartes' other suggestion, an harmonious edifice. But here Descartes is thinking of quite another matter—the vast orbits of celestial bodies, hung in space, never colliding; a vast universal machine; a *cosmos* created from chaos, by the orderly motions decreed within it according to preëstablished laws. And so motion, contemplated most generally and magnificently in the courses of the stars, was the operation of God, the continual creation of God. And mind? Mind, another creation of God, regarded the process, about which there was nothing it could do.

But (and here we may leave Descartes) was not a human *body* also matter? And did it not also move? And did not this contemplating mind seem to be in some sense *in,* or *of* the body? And did it not believe itself to move, and appear to move, that body to which it seemed in some way attached? And yet, if mind, or soul, could do nothing about matter save contemplate it, how was it to move that particular portion of matter which made up the body to which it appeared in some way attached?

Someone hit upon the solution of this difficulty, and the solution was called *occasionalism.* According to this solution, when the soul wished to move, an arm shall we say, God moved the arm for that soul. It was part of God's original plan and contract in creating souls that, whatever motion the soul wished imparted to its body, God would cause the body so to move. We may now begin to realize that, as Malebranche noted in the phrase quoted from him above, things were beginning to be understood about the difference between soul and body which had not been previously known.

Occasionalism was, of course, but one of those logical incongruities which make lurking absurdities evident. Soul and body just could not be left upon such distant terms, in such a close and constant relationship. There were three apparent possibilities. Either soul and body must get upon some workable basis of interaction or significant relationship; or the mind must run the whole show, moving and forming matter, endowing it with qualities of active and potent reality, even perhaps creating the only reality it possessed; or matter must be endowed with such potencies that it could run things so effectively that the soul was superfluous, an easily rejected interloper, loafing about with nothing important to do. And, if this latter theory were accepted, endowing matter with everything necessary to explain the material universe, might matter not have itself created the soul, as a little *jeu d'esprit?*

So, in the absurdity of the theory of occasionalism, the subsequent course of modern metaphysics may be said to have been generated. We have rejected many subsequent theories as not satisfactory; we can scarcely be said to have found one that is. But the first attempt was to get soul and body together, each of them playing a rôle of some dignity.

Metaphysics is hardly our affair, but the first such attempt of commanding importance which followed was entitled *Ethics,* its subject matter might be said to be entirely, God. We may therefore presume it to be of importance to us here.

This *Ethics* was written by Baruch de Spinoza, who was younger than Descartes by a generation. Though he entitled his work *Ethics,* it can with difficulty be called a treatise on that subject. The title rather indicates the fact that, in the new intellectual world which had arisen, the problem of conduct had in some way become very closely knit up with metaphysics. In the medieval world conduct, in ethical theory, had largely to do with gaining the reward of heaven or the punishment of hell. Beyond this conduct was the performing of acts of no presumed importance ethically, the purpose of which was to get through the life that preceded this punishment or reward. That is to say, conduct, in so far as it had to do with morals or religion, became significant at a Last Judgment; aside from conduct presumed important in this final sense, conduct had the carnal and evanescent purpose of living, and getting a living.

In consequence of such conception, the *effect* of human actions was not consciously traced outside the person performing the action, and into the world. For example, a laborer might, according to his disposition toward his labor, praise God in his work, or he might accept the curse laid upon Adam, to gain his living by the sweat of his brow. One built a cathedral, ostensibly, *to the greater glory of God,* not to the stimulation of the æsthetic or religious susceptibilities of the worshiper. Charity was supposed to *save* the charitable *at the Last Day;* it was not a matter for ethical theory to consider how it might save the object of the charity, either in a present need, or as a more permanent effect on his disposition. We may note with some astonishment how St. Louis, saintly pattern of a medieval king, thought of the poor as made *for the instruction* of himself and his kind.[11]

---

[11] De Joinville, *Histoire de Saint Louis.*

So we note, from a new standpoint, how the medieval world, carved by thought into nicely defined portions, and so set before men by God, served the moral part of conduct by reminding human beings who contemplated it under the proper categories, that "the unseen intelligible principles" of God, from the creation of the universe thenceforth, and even his eternal power and godhead, might be gazed upon, and thus perceived, through the material things of his creation.[12] But now the physical world had become less an *order of things* than a *succession of motions.*[13] Things refused to stay put; they went from here to there, changed from this to that. Of course they had always done so, but now this motion and change was that upon which speculative attention fixed itself. The universe was no longer a sign language, but a whirring machine in constant motion.

This was not all. It had also been discovered (first practically in the Renaissance, and now speculation began to take a hand) that human thought and volition did things to portions of the universe; or that such activity appeared to do things. Occasionalism said No. Man did nothing really to nature. Human thought and physical mechanics touched at no point. What really happened was that God did things to nature when human volition wished him to. This of course was a most ineffective quibble. If God accommodated men by doing for them what they wished done in moving material bodies, a denial that men's wills effectively altered the operation of God's great machine was an empty form of words. So Spinoza's metaphysics becomes an ethics, because it had become so necessary to show how and why human activity of thought and will can do nothing essentially and *substantially* harmful to the universe. His solution of the problem is set down with geometric order and certainty. The essential nature of anything is *substance.* All substances are necessarily infinite, and there cannot be two of the same nature or quality; and two existing substances would have nothing in common, and could not affect each other.[14] There cannot, therefore, be a substance *matter* and another substance *mind,* one acting upon, limiting, directing, or influencing the other. There cannot be substantial minds, divine or human, in any essential or substantial sense interacting. The Universe is *One*, mind and matter. Human souls, in substance, cannot be separate from the divine spirit and activity. Consider this one substance in its passivity, it is *matter,* fluid or malleable; consider it in its activity, it is active spirit, *soul.* Spinoza had, of course, terms to define this unity of substance in two aspects. Considered passively the universe is *passive nature* (*natura naturata*); considered actively it is *active nature* (*natura naturans*); considered comprehensively, all together, it is *God.*

---

[12] "For the wrath of God is disclosed from heaven against all impiety and injustice of men hindering the truth by wrongdoing. For the things known about God are evident in themselves, for God is manifested in them. Indeed his unseen intelligible principles, from the creation of the universe, are seen in created things, even his invisible power and godhead," Romans I, 20.

[13] For Descartes physics is mechanics (letter to a friend).

It is often more important to understand the purpose of a philosopher, his commanding interest in his system, than his ordered reasoning. The argument of Spinoza was directed toward the purpose of showing that human beings, at once, in two different aspects, *natura naturata* and *natura naturans,* were, save where and when their action was effectively a portion of divine activity, mere temporary, unsubstantial impediments in an eternal process. All action was activity of God; and whatever other gesturing might *seem to be* activity was nothing of substance, and touched nowhere the substantial mass of the universe which really *was.* And so, as almost the final proposition of his treatise, Spinoza sets the statement: "The more of perfection each individual thing possesses, the more does it act, and the less does it suffer (suffering is, in its Latin etymology, a passive effort of supporting, and Spinoza was writing Latin); and the more it acts the more perfect it is." [15] The Stoics had aimed to become one with God by bearing things, floating with the tide of divine purpose, armored against error. Medieval Christians, in the monastic and in the mystic tradition, had aimed to become one with God by stripping off their active powers. For Spinoza, one was united with God in activity: "He who has the body apt for or capable of many things, has a mind the greatest part of which is eternal."[16]

---

[14] Propositions viii, v, ii, iii, *Ethics* of Spinoza.

[15] *Ethics,* Part V, prop. xl.

Spinoza's thought was pantheism of the clearest and most evident character. Needless to say it was more than unwelcome, even accursed. But the problem with which it was concerned was not accursed, and he is of interest here because he makes it so clear what this problem was. First of all the old problem of the *freedom of the will* had become important in an entirely new context. When Pelagius and Augustine had argued the matter, the aspect of prime importance was the question whether human beings, by ascetic discipline, were capable of saving themselves; or whether the original sin inherited from Adam could only be removed with the assistance of sacraments conferred by authorized priests of the Church. Now, oddly enough, it was a heretic who occupied more generally Augustine's position, and the Church took rather the position of Pelagius. So, when Luther said that men were saved by the grace of God,[17] the Church, which had embedded its mediation in practices less essentially strenuous, but comparable to those of a Pelagius, thundered at Luther's followers the charge that they "cast aside good works." So Luther stood with Pelagius in declaring that men were not saved by the Church, and with Augustine in his conviction that they were saved by being laid hold on by the grace of God. The Church now stood with Pelagius in insisting upon the efficacy of "good works," though a little differently defined, and remained consistent with itself in continuing to claim to hold the keys of heaven.

So, it may be seen, the theological fortunes of the question of free will, applied to the problem of eternal salvation, had not been monotonous. And now again this question of freedom of the will poked its head around the corner of the theological thoroughfare, upon its old and proper shoulders: the *problem of evil.*

Spinoza had quite literally annihilated evil. Without substance it merely *was not.* Evil deeds, and controversial words about them, were written on something even less substantial than shifting sands; and were obliterated utterly by the atmospheric currents of *natura naturans.* The question of freedom was not less definitely set aside. All real action was *free* action, and acting freely, man was God. For practical purposes it would always remain difficult to know (different for the person himself, difficult for the Church, or for any governing body) whether or not any gesture which looked like action was formidable, dangerous, or destructive, as a real, free, and substantial act; or whether it was but a threatening thundercloud bearing no menace to anything real. Therefore the protective instincts wakened against Spinoza were perhaps of that common-sense irrationality which one might praise a little, were it not able, without such encouragement, to so often perpetrate blind and cruel stupidities.

---

[16] *Ethics,* Part V, prop. xxxix.

[17] "So Gott ohne unser Thun in uns schaffet und wirket." Luther, *Ep. St. Paul* a. d. Galater, par. 10.

Spinoza declared beyond the pale of respectability, freedom and the problem of evil remained, as companion subjects of speculation. The somewhat disorderly justification of God's work in Creation, written by a contemporary of Spinoza (the *Theodicée* of Leibnitz) is full of these related problems. Substituting innumerable "monads" for Spinoza's single "substance," Leibnitz ties together the active and passive, the body and soul aspects, of these monads with what he calls a "preëstablished harmony." [18] But again, the being of these monads is activity. Evil, though not reduced to nothing as in Spinoza, became of hardly more troublesome subsistence, since it was seen partly as merely provisional and passing, partly as an *apparent* evil, which deceives because of our incapacity to see and comprehend the universe entire. And so the system of Leibnitz won the classifying soubriquet of *optimism.* His *Theodicée,* written to justify the universe, as the creation of a Being perfectly good, was widely welcomed immediately after its appearance, at the very beginning of the eighteenth century. It was, however, typical rather of the seventeenth than of the eighteenth century. In the former half of the latter century Voltaire satirized this opitimism with cutting sarcasm in his *Candide.*

---

[18] "Souls act according to the laws of final causes through appetitions, ends, and means. Bodies act according to the laws of efficient causes or motions. And the two realms, that of efficient and of final causes, are in harmony with each other" (*Monadology,* par. 79).

It is necessary, in order to comprehend the intellectual forces which more and more shaped religion as the seventeenth century advanced, to step aside as we have done from the more direct interests of religious doctrine and of life; for a changed temper soon became evident, and this change was due far less to the working out of forces inherent in the Reformation period than to new problems and interests of speculative philosophy. By the beginning of the seventeenth century life was departing from the large controversial interests bred of the Reformation. Roman Catholicism had determined generally its type of defense against Protestantism, and had planned its new existence in divided Christendom. Lutheranism and Calvinism still had both their contending and contentious theologians, but the commanding interests of religion were no longer with them.[19] They were fighting battles for sectarian theories, and the gaze of human searchers after salvation turned from them toward those who were speculating as to the broader problems of the nature of the world and human fate; while the theologians themselves remained long blind to the sharp contradiction between the new point of view and that which governed their own thought.[20] While, for example, Calvinists and Arminians were arguing as to whether the divine decree predestining some human beings to salvation, others to damnation, was a part of the original scheme of creation, or whether it was a divine alteration of that plan, in consequence of the "fall of man" through Adam's sin,[21] the more vital religious interests were concerned with the question as to how men were to live, as aspirants for salvation promised by their religion, in the world while awaiting it; or how life and activity in the world might attach itself to the ultimate eternal purpose of Christian life.

It was the new thought which tendered them all the conditions of this problem. It had split them first, clearly, into *souls* and *bodies*. These souls were not, as theories concerning predestination might conceive them to be, fine-blown bottles, which might contain an eternally precious, or again a putrefying liquid. They appeared to be entities of which it was the essential nature to *act*. Human beings were not therefore engaged in guarding from contamination a precious possession. They were incessantly using this possession. The doctrine of *free-will* furnished the possibility, and the doctrine of *original sin* the innate tendency which led to punishment. So, from the standpoint of the soul as essentially an actor, life became a complicated affair. And then too there was the body. The body was a complicated machine for this new thought, and since there was a soul, essentially active, somehow attached to it, the body was a machine which was either incessantly running, or what men called a corpse. And since the body was the soul's machine, and the soul must act, to reduce the body, so far as possible, to a corpse, by mortification, was an absurd contradiction.

---

[19] See Tulloch, *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century,* I, 20ff.

[20] Pünjer, *Geschichte der Christlichen Religionsphilosophie seit der Reformation,* I, 294.

[21] The former were known as "Supralapsarians," the latter as "Infralapsarians."

There was still a further complication. The body appeared to be, in many aspects, like to or even a part of the still more complex all-embracing universal machine. So, if the essentially active soul, using the freedom it possessed, and even the tendency, to act wrongly, moved alone, or with the assistance of God as the occasionalists preferred, even a limb in counter-direction to God's purpose for the universe, it was not altogether certain that the divine material creation was not in consequence in some way injured.

It therefore obviously became, to an extent unusual for the medieval period, of importance that a religious institution or teaching should do something more than insure a life after death. That might still be of commanding importance to the individual, but society as a whole, which might continue to exist in a universe somehow spoiled by individual actions, might now begin to ask of a religious institution claiming social support, what it did to keep its adherents from acting in socially detrimental ways. It was no longer enough that a church claimed to possess prerogatives; it might be asked to perform services, not with respect to some other world, but in this one. Religious institutions, in short, were to inherit the new philosophy for a considerable part as a new social-moral demand made upon them.

The individual also was to be led slowly to readjust his relationship to the religious institution to which he adhered. He had not only a soul to save, but a life to live, and the living of that life and the saving of that soul were problems knit together in a new sort of way. So, except where it might possess power to interfere with his material purposes, the matter of how a religious organization worked, in itself, came to concern the layman less than the mere matter of how the religious organization served him, in the place where he wanted it. Church organization, ecclesiastical politics, even doctrinal discussion, might be left more and more to those who served directly, and lived by, the religious organization itself, while the layman chose, or merely inherited, one type or another to which he might cleave, largely for what he got out of it personally. We are, in short, at the beginning of the long struggle; on the one hand, of the churches to maintain a place in society consistent with the eternal dignity and import they claimed for their social function, and of secular society on the other, to find and to set religious institutions in a place where they might be found by those who wanted them when they were wanted, and might otherwise be in no way disturbing or encumbering.

So, with the seventeenth century, begins a process in which laity and clergy are in a new sense to be separated, and in a new relationship to be joined. In this new situation we shall find the clergy drawing closer together in the Roman Church. With this closer solidarity forming, the Church passed through the eighteenth century, with its troubling French Revolution, through the trials of the nineteenth century, papal prerogatives and popular papal prestige increasing, in the religious sphere newly defined, while the Church was losing little by little, finally altogether, its temporal power. Protestant Christianity, with no unity save what it some places gained as a State Church, had little to be gained in the way of clerical solidarity from this movement. Had it been disposed to combat the encroachments of secularization, of any dominant type of thought or of social motivation, it would have possessed little of united clerical interest with which to do so.

So much for the new separation between clergy and laity in the growing social scheme. In the new relation of union between clergy and laity Roman Catholicism and Protestantism came to face a problem which touched them more equally. Pastoral care came into existence in a new sense, more or less at the same time, in Protestantism and in the Roman Church with the Jesuit Company. As the political importance of the churches lessened, the sphere of pastoral care broadened. But the emphasis of this pastoral care came gradually to shift. The Jesuit Company set itself to work to discover what the laity, of various classes, wanted from the Church, and to supply the demand, as consistently as convenient in varying circumstances. In Protestantism, as the authority of preachers waned, and when in the nineteenth century particularly the *social order* began to exercise the idealism and speculation of men in various ways, the churches set about, in a more scattered manner, to try to discover what men and women wanted from religion, or if not from religion, what churches could supply that they did want.

## LV

The sixteenth century had dislocated and crisscrossed all ideas, not only of religious but of political authority. Indeed religious and political authority were so bound together, in practice, theory, and habitual way of thinking, that one could not have been disturbed without disturbance to the other. Speculation as to the nature and source of political authority had flourished during this century. The speculation might be roughly likened to a triangle: the princes on one corner, with those who argued for their supremacy; the advocates of a popular source of political authority on another; with religion as the apex of the triangle, Protestant opinion tending more often to emphasize the independent power of princes, that of the Roman Church, as voiced by the Jesuit Company, advancing and supporting theories which might be used to depose monarchs who became tyrants or heretics against the will of the people.

More important than theory was the situation which arose in France at the end of the religious wars. The assassination of Henry III of France was the first European regicide to cause discussion and difference of opinion. Shortly after, a half-crazed fanatic, who had been under Jesuit influence, and apparently hoped to escape the punishment of hell by doing so, attempted to assassinate Henry IV. Here the question was practically put, as to whether a Protestant could rule over Catholics; as later in England, the similar question, as to a Catholic ruling over Protestants was to be decided by the deposition of James II.

In general none doubted the divine source of political authority; hardly more than in the Middle Ages. It was merely that the whole matter of religious authority had become vastly more complicated. Religion was an ingredient in all political movements of popular influence. The most radical social-revolutionary uprisings, such as the Peasants' War in Germany, claimed Scriptural authority, as did also the theocratic aspirations of Calvinism. And if the papacy backed the side of popular sovereignty, it was hardly more than a method of emphasizing the essential illegitimacy of heretic monarchs, and counteracting a growing independent authority which might not always be docile under papal guidance.

In reaction against the social confusion and disorder of the preceding century, a desire for peace and order grew during the seventeenth century. Richelieu, coming to power in France shortly after the death of the energetic but conciliating Henry IV, utilized this desire to crush the strong nobles. In the end this same desire for peace and order did much to bring about a rather arbitrary and autocratic peace to end the Thirty Years War in Germany. Similar aspiration entered into the policy of the Stuarts in England, but here it struck a snag, ending with the deposition and execution of Charles I.

Underneath all this movement to strengthen the power of monarchs there was an idea, and an idea of religious coloring. Since, in a religiously divided Christendom, absolute power—the only sort of political authority under which peace and order seemed sufficiently assured—might no longer everywhere claim ultimate derivation from the Vicar of the Prince of Peace, monarchs tended to inherit something of what the pope had lost. The popular imagination, stimulated by propaganda and by more disinterested speculation, came more and more to emphasize the sanctity of kings, as direct vice-regents of God in the political sphere.

Kings had been invested, even in the Middle Ages, with garments and with an aroma of sanctity. As early as the eighth century had arisen, in France and in England, the custom of anointing the monarch at his coronation with sacred oil, as a quasi-priestly personage. But this by no means made him a king by divine right, but rather in consequence of priestly benediction conferred by the Church. It was no part of the program of Gregory VII to increase the popular appeal of their sacred character. He wrote in 1051:

> Where, among emperors and kings, will you find a man who, without mentioning the apostles and martyrs, has equalled by his miracles Saint

Martin, Saint Anthony, or Saint Benedict? What emperor or king has raised the dead, given soundness to lepers, or sight to the blind? [1]

But it was not possible for the popular imagination to divorce sanctity from power to perform miracles, and very early, both in France and in England, the royal *touch* was believed to cure disease.[2] Soon they became specialists in the cure of one common disease, scrofula, which came to be known in the latter country as the *King's Evil.*

Such popular belief was not of importance sufficient to arouse great enthusiasm either for or against, until, in the fourteenth century, the independent power of secular monarchs began to grow, despite medieval papal claims. Some prominence was given to the "many evident miracles in favor of the sick" performed by Philip the Fair, who arrested one pope, and took his successor under his supervision at Avignon.[3] An archbishop of Canterbury testified to the miracles of Edward III of England, several times at loggerheads with the Avignon papacy during the same century.[4]

During the fifteenth century another popular belief testifying to the divine origin of kingly power attained some prominence. It was popularly questioned as to whether Charles VII of France had borne upon his body, at his birth, the *fleur de lis,* marking him as France's legitimate ruler. Lutheran leaders, in the sixteenth century, thought they had discovered the divine mark upon the body of the Elector of Saxony, Luther's protector. Members of the Hapsburg family destined to rule were believed to be born with a white spot, in form of a cross, upon their skin. At the beginning of the seventeenth century it became a matter of common report that James I, born with but the hope of being king of Scotland, had been marked with the sign destining him to rule over England as well. An old theme of folk lore and fairy legend came to be of political importance.

---

[1] Gregory VII to the Bishop of Metz, quoted from Bloch, *Les Rois Thaumaturges,* 123.

[2] In the tenth century in France, shortly after 1100 in England.

[3] Bloch, 250.

[4] This account of Edward's miracles was written while the author was the king's chaplain.

The seventeenth century saw such popular beliefs attesting the divinity of kings in full flower. A scrupulous monarch of Protestant upbringing, such as James I of England, who "did not see how he could cure the sick without miracles, whereas miracles had ceased and were no longer performed," was still obliged to public expectation and belief to try his hand. In the court routine of Louis XIV of France, *touching for the scrofula* attained the dignity of being announced by posted placards:

> Be it known to all interested persons, that on Sunday next, being Easter Day, His Majesty will touch those afflicted with Scrofula, in the galleries of the Louvre, at ten o'clock in the morning. . . . Done at Paris by the King's command, the twenty-sixth of March, 1657.

Such was the popular aspect of the *divine right of kings,* which began to grow from the period of the Council of Constance, and ripened in the later seventeenth century.[5] Almost more surprising than this popular aspect of the theory were the pronouncements of its literary apologists, both Catholic and Protestant, as political absolutism came more and more to assert itself. On his deathbed the eyes of Louis XIII (of France) suffused with tears, while "the two majesties, divine and human, held loving converse." [6] In the last *States General* of France, before the one which assembled on the eve of the Revolution, it was a Protestant who proposed an article proclaiming the absolute divine power of kings.[7] The courtier Bishop Bossuet might go still further:

> Princes are gods, according to the witness of holy Scripture, and partake in a fashion of the divine independence . . . the royal throne is not the throne of a man, but the throne of God himself . . . the worship of God and the respect for the King are two united things.[8]

Perhaps no one thing did more to help Charles I of England lose his throne than the prevalence of this idea, with the assistance of which he was often able to compromise a good intention with some insistence upon a petty matter of prerogative. In the troubled atmosphere of Germany the conception took another form during the Thirty Years War, spreading broadcast, and gaining general acceptance for the conception (known as *Erastianism*) that whatever be the religion of the prince, this should be accepted as their religion by his subjects. In France for a time (toward 1682) even Jesuits, who had been the Pope's valiant soldiers in fighting against any exaggeration of regal authority, bent the knee. However, two dazzling thrones of divine brilliance, one in Rome, another in Paris or Whitehall, were likely to be not less confusing to worshipful eyes than two wisps of equally delectable hay, fastened to right and left of the hungry eyes of Buridan's Ass. Absolute political authority of divine origin, divided or shifted, was but the medieval authority further complicated. Lutheranism had the best theoretical basis for it, but in Lutheran Germany there was no strong monarch to profit by it. Calvinists retained, until they had arranged to put princes in their proper, modest, decorative place, at least the theoretical right to advise, instruct, and censure them from their pulpits. And even that monarch whose claim to cousinship to the Deity was most imposing (Louis XIV) was playing more or less the Pope's game before the end of his reign; revoking Huguenot freedom of worship; raging against the Puritans of French Catholicism (Jansenists), and turning a religious movement into a political faction which advanced, during the eighteenth century, from rabid Gallicanism to revolution and regicide. So the theory of the divine right of kings, with its trappings of speculation, adulation, and miracle, while helping for a time to order divided Christendom, marked but a passing stage in the dissolution of the religious-social-political unity of medieval aspiration.

---

[5] The divine right of kings is stated as a fully conscious theory by a minister of Ferdinand and Isabella, at the end of the fifteenth century. John of Torquemada, *De Potestate Papae.* See *Cambridge Modern History,* III, 736ff.

[6] D'Avenel, *Richelieu et la monarchie absolue,* I, 178 and note.

[7] Funck-Brentano, *Le Roi,* 182.

[8] D'Avenel, I, 179, so quotes Bossuet.

Deeper than this last attempt to strengthen political power with a spontaneous impulse to worship kings, there was growing another factor, loosed to act destructively on the whole in the sixteenth century, but gradually harnessed as a peaceful instrument. This was the gradual centering of religion in the life of individuals. This movement is marked by three currents. The nearest and most obvious resource in making religion harmless, was that of popularizing mysticism. The second current was one making toward religious toleration. The third was marked by a shift of emphasis, in Christian ideal, from the virtue of *humility,* to the virtue of *charity.*

It is always and everywhere an embarrassment to religion, and conspicuously so for Christianity, that its tradition accumulates here and there elements of the heroic. A Jesus who dies upon a cross, because of unwillingness to show a pliable front to important people, may be made a *savior* for everyone, if by dying once upon a cross for everyone, he removes from some millions of followers the painful necessity of dying themselves, upon some millions of crosses, to accomplish their salvation. A Gregory VII, with an ideal such as touches with temptation to emulate but a very few, may inspire a broken succession of pontiffs for some centuries. But the moment that a religious ideal, heroically conceived (for heroism is hardly less heroic because of a subsequent decision that it was of mistaken purpose) goes out to win people in a broad mass, it must pitch its aspiration in a lower key.

The Middle Ages had arranged the Christian religious tradition rather well for different classes of the religiously inclined. There was a place for heroes, who could not only be heroic without danger of social disapprobation, but could, in their heroism, serve others vicariously in various ways. The average decent citizen found little difficulty in being sufficiently religious to keep his name upon the roster of the saved. The conspicuous sinner was excellently served, since a host of saints worked for him, headed by the Virgin, who interfered with the processes of divine justice in ways as unreasonable and unexpected as a capricious, beautiful, and generously impulsive princess might be credited with doing. Moreover, it was greatly to the credit of God to be able to snatch from Satan, at the very moment when he seemed most certainly entrapped, some frightened wretch, at last trembling before the enormity of his misdoings.

So, in its various orders fixed and established, medieval men and women externalized their complexity in a generous breadth of social color and variety, protected all by the comforting shadow of the Church's ministrations. The struggle of sin and salvation was dramatic, vivid with quick changes and sharp contrasts. But the too rapid liberation of the individual, coming as it did with a rude shaking of confidence in established authorities, frightened human beings into themselves, at the same time that threatened authorities felt the necessity of lopping off external peculiarities. The surface of life became more unified, and the variety and complexity was turned inward. Soul and body did, in a measure according to the ultimate tendencies of the metaphysical thought of the time, attempt to live two separate lives, outwardly harmonized to the great universal machine, inwardly certain of little save what could be based upon their inward consciousness. Christians began to attack the task, as indicated in the second quotation at the beginning of the preceding chapter, of living "altogether in the world" and at the same time "an altogether spiritual life."

None the less, the individual life, separated between body and soul, needed no less in religion than in philosophy, its *occasionalism,* or its *preëstablished harmony.* Symbol and authority could not suffice to link the two lives, for however much the symbol or authority might remain fixed, life was activity and motion, and consequently the relation between the symbol, or authority, and life could not remain a fixed relation. One could not hope to touch with his extended hands a star, even *a*-tiptoe on some sacrament. An interval of activity stretched between. It had been a relatively easy thing, in the Middle Ages, to set out toward the evening of life when one had reached the limit of prudent sinning, for the Holy Land, or some nearer place of pilgrimage, hoping to unload his sins there, all in a lump. But such pilgrimage awakened less enthusiasm and confidence in the seventeenth century.

The mystics, however, had discovered another sort of pilgrimage which, though more complicated, need not take one necessarily even a mile from home. By the early years of the seventeenth century all the works of the great mystics had been translated into

French,[9] and so much in general may be said for other important European languages. Such works circulated even in small villages. They had portrayed the mystic way as one of changes and stages. To be sure much of their work was out of date, since many of them had made not the slightest attempt to live altogether in the world. But this evident anachronism made it but the more easy to expurgate other incommodities from their precepts. A great deal of valuable experience had been gained in giving the *Spiritual Exercises* of Loyola to persons who made no little pretension to the heroic, and had not the slightest intention of rejecting mundane activities. There could no longer be reasonable doubt but that tangible results of a mystic character could be effected in persons of moderate aspiration, nor was it to be questioned that there were spiritual delights within reasonable reach, which might be enjoyed in contemplative moments, even between a warm breakfast and a satisfying luncheon.

Everywhere that either the French or the Jesuit influence penetrated, and combined or separate they went far in this century, there was a passion for moderation, for order, and for *le bon sense* which cooled every other passion. Satan himself attained good manners, and must be addressed with the habitual courtesy of the well-bred. "*Monsieur le Diable,*" said a Frenchman, who saw a heavy chair move toward him, floating in the empty atmosphere, "the interest of God apart, I am your servant, but I pray you not to frighten me more than you have already." [10] When the struggle between king and parliament began in England both sides took arms half-heartedly. One who (Falkland), having first striven hard for a moderate and tolerant church, finally took the side of the king whom he did not trust, courted almost immediate death in battle. Parliament fought for control of purse strings, and for the sort of peace they wanted; cavaliers, with petty and avaricious jealousies seemed only to fight for themselves; [11] and the cavalier army sang of the time when again there would be, at the royal palace,

[9] Brémond, *Le Sentiment Religieux en France,* I, 19.
[10] Du Bléd, *op. cit.,* 41-42.
[11] Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion,* in numberless places.

—rich perfume
In every room,

. . . .

When the time it shall be
That the King enjoys his own again.[12]

The same Coton who had captivated Henry IV of France, and reestablished the Jesuits at court, so guided a mystic of Provence that her raptures took place "in perfect tranquillity and quiet . . . without convulsions or tremblings," and in her visionary experiences she upheld mankind, "an army filing by in perfect order," in ranks according with the hierarchies of Church, State, and Society.[13]

Convents became places of fashionable retreat, into which ladies of highest birth might retire permanently, or at intervals, to escape ennui, gain refreshment, taste celestial joys, converse with the unworldly, returning if and when they wished to the exactions of their social life. Teresa's Order of Carmelites of strict observance was established in Paris, under the most aristocratic patronage. A young princess of the Bourbon family who frequented the Sisters there, troubled because her mother wished her to make her entrance to fashionable society by attending a ball, might be advised that, since it was her mother's wish, she should go, but in order to make it a penance and not a pleasure, she should wear a hair shirt underneath her ball gown. Unfortunately this ball proved so entrancing that this particular princess gave up her idea of entering the convent more permanently.[14]

Also, as a result of the Jesuit Company's experience in communicating the *Spiritual Exercises* of Loyola and acting as spiritual advisers to important people, it had become the custom for fashionable ladies all to have spiritual advisers, and there developed the most tender spiritual relationships, inviting correspondence, the spiritual content of which made fitting frequent repetition of such affectionate phrases as *ma Fille, ma cher Fille, ma très cher Fille, ma toute cher Fille.*

---

[12] Quoted by Wingfield-Stratford, *op. cit.,* I, 533.

[13] Brémond, *Le Sentiment Religieux,* II, 60.

[14] De Noialles, *La Mère du Grand Condé,* chap. xii. Entitled "Le Carmel et la Vie Mondaine."

The habit of *manuals* of devotion had grown, with the example of Loyola's *Exercises* and the invention of printing. As the sister of Louis XIV (*La Grande Mademoiselle*) expressed it, having herself drawn up such a manual (when, after a tumultuous and headstrong career, involved in many difficulties by her love for a clever courtier, whom she could not be allowed to marry, she became a very pious old lady) since it was not always possible for those much occupied with worldly temptations to retire for self-examination, "Drawing one's book from one's pocket, there might be immediately found lessons appropriate to make one embrace the good and avoid the evil." [15]

To draw up the classical manual of devotion for this situation fell to the lot of one François de Sales, Bishop and Prince of Geneva. He states his purpose in the Preface.

> Those who have written of religious devotion, have most of them intended their writings for the instruction of persons much withdrawn from worldly intercourse, or leastwise they have taught a kind of devotional practice fitting to such complete retirement from the world. My intention is to instruct those who live in cities, in households, at court . . . and I shall demonstrate to such that, just as the mother-of-pearl lives in the midst of the sea, never contaminated by a drop of salt water . . . so may a vigorous and constant soul live in the world, without acquiring a worldly disposition, finding springs of gentle piety amidst the bitter waves of the world, and fluttering among the flames of mundane covetousness without singeing the wings of holy desire.[16]

The devotion taught by François de Sales follows modestly the great mystics. He writes, in answer to the query of a lady:

> You may read with utility the works of Mother Teresa and Saint Catherine of Siena . . . but do not hurry yourself toward the practice of everything of beauty you may see there; rather proceed very slowly (*allez très doucement*).

Mentioning three mystic works, he says of them that they "journey toward the very summit of the mountains: with them one should scarcely amuse herself." [17] Religious enthusiasts have a way of plunging, with almost ferocious ardor, into austerities. The pupils of de Sales are advised to slip more gently and imperceptibly into austerity, "little by little"; [18] to strip themselves of private property gradually, so that, almost unperceived, the grace of poverty shall have descended upon them.[19] "We should not be astonished," he writes, "to discover ourselves imperfect." [20] "Humility renders us untroubled by our imperfections, remembering those of others; for why should we be more perfect than others?" [21] The great subjects of meditation all "terminate in hope and confidence. Meditations which terminate in fear, particularly of death and hell, are dangerous." [22] Also dangerous both to the head and to the stomach are nightly vigils.[23]

---

[15] *Un Ouvrage de Piété Inconnu de la Grande Mademoiselle,* ed. by Rodocanachi, Paris, 1903 in the *Avertissement* of the original edition, 1685.

[16] De Sales, *Introduction à la Vie Dévote,* Preface.

[17] Lettre, CXXXI.

As it is dangerous to dwell too persistently upon one's imperfections, so it is little less than foolish to "remain for long infected with sin," since in confession one has "a cure so present and so easy." [24]

The task for which François de Sales offers himself as guide is to sweeten life with piety, "as sugar sweetens unripe fruit." [25] It is to make life more gentle, tranquil, hopeful, by sprinkling upon it the perfume of that eternity in which the great mystics, with torturing experiences, had dipped entire.

It was not, to be sure, without its dangers. Even the wicked might work miracles,[26] and Saint Bonaventura had taught that sometimes persons had been seduced into believing that Jesus or "his very glorious Mother" had appeared to them, receiving gentle consolations of an altogether deceptive nature.[27] It was later in the seventeenth century that a cardinal gave such warnings. He still believes in moderation. Whatever may have been the practice of former times, he writes:

> These times in which the world has arrived at its old age, seem to demand that one avoid everything which may attract admiring attention,

---

[18] *Ibid.,* LIV, to an abbess.

[19] *Ibid.,* LII, to the same abbess.

[20] *Ibid.,* XLV.

[21] *Ibid.,* LII.

[22] *Ibid.,* LXIII.

[23] *Ibid.,* LXIII.

[24] *Introduction à la Vie Dévote,* Part II, chap. xix.

[25] *Ibid.,* Part I, chap. ii.

[26] Cardinal Bona, *Traité du Discernement des Esprits,* 1672, chap. vi.

[27] *Ibid.,* chap. vii.

> and which is contrary to usage and custom, and the one should apply himself to the inward way of uniting oneself to God in a more direct manner, avoiding all *éclat.*[28]

For after all there was but one safe way in which the spirit of God might be discerned from other evil spirits which might counterfeit it, which was "to have no opinion which was not conformed to the holy Scriptures . . . and never to wander from the opinions of the holy Fathers and the common opinion of orthodox doctors, since it is an unsupportable presumption to raise oneself above them." [29]

It is too much to expect to find the spirit of tolerance conspicuous among French Protestants, a minority who had suffered, and were again before the seventeenth century closed, to suffer persecution. But if we pass to England, moderation and gentleness find expression in the whole group of which Lord Falkland was perhaps the leading figure; in the group of Cambridge Platonists; but most winningly in the quaint and whimsical spirit of Sir Thomas Browne.

> For my religion [he writes], though there be several circumstances which might persuade the world that I have none at all . . . yet, in despite thereof, I dare without usurpation assume the honorable title of a Christian. Not that I merely owe this title to the Font, my education, or the clime wherein I was born . . . but having in my riper years seen and examined all, I find myself obliged by the principles of Grace, and the Law of mine own Reason, to embrace no other name than this.[30]

Browne is conscious of a "geography of religions, as well as of lands," and while by choice of the "new reformed religion" can find pleasure in exercising at times his devotion even in some "popish" fashion. He rather loves mysteries, not to dispute about but "to lose himself in."

> Where there is an obscurity too deep for our Reason, 'tis good to sit down with a description, periphrasis or adumbration; for on acquainting our Reason how unable it is to display the visible and obvious effects of

[28] Bona, *Ibid.,* chap. viii.

[29] *Ibid.,* same chapter.

[30] Sir Thomas Browne, *Religio Medici.*

> Nature, it becomes more humble and submissive unto the subtleties of Faith; and thus I teach my haggard and unreclaimed Reason to stoop to the lure of Faith . . . and this I think no vulgar part of Faith, to believe a thing not only above but contrary to Reason, and against the Arguments of our proper senses.[31]

This gentle speculative tolerance, giving rein to fancy, might be described as the masculine brother of the obedient contemplative feminine fashion of losing-oneself-in-a-mystery fathered by François de Sales. Both were at least equally far from the discordant and acrimonious noise of the Reformation, and each fell back, in its own way, upon a gentle grace of God extended to fallible humanity. It has been said that Mary Magdalene was the preferred saint and heroine of the seventeenth century:[32] The Magdalene, endowed by human imagination with all the charms and graces with which beauty tempts to sin, and seated none the less, in the largeness of divine forgiveness, very near the center of divine favor. "We are all monsters," says Sir Thomas, "that is a composition of man and beast." The mood was often one of taking this fact, even when it was taken religiously, with considerable complacency. One is reminded of lines in a poem of John Donne, written toward the beginning of the century, describing the comfortable captivity of two dolphins who had been swallowed by a whale:

> Swim in him swallow'd dolphins without fear,
> And feel no sides, as if his vast womb were
> An inland sea . . .[33]

While still holding theoretically to heaven and hell, and to the saving grace of baptism, people might find it difficult none the less to admit the Magdalene to celestial joys, while condemning Virgil, as Dante's logic forced him to do, to the murky outer borders of the infernal regions. In the intellectual sphere, the attempt of this movement of tolerance was to broaden the doctrinal basis of the Church of England, in recognition of the personal and subjective nature of the deepest elements of religious faith. So the English *latitudinarians,* seeking a minimum of doctrinal uniformity, desired to set this lower limit in adherence to the articles of the so-called Apostles Creed. Tolerance was forced, among Roman Catholics, to take a practical rather than a speculative form, and indeed elsewhere was likely most of all to illumine the countenance of God with a more kindly indulgence of human frailty. To repent of evil was to be almost innocent,[34] and, since human beings were such mixtures of harmful and serviceable deeds, God might be enjoined not to forget his reward of the one in chastising the other.[35] The measure of this indulgence was not difficult to take, since the king was an earthly image of the divine.[36] In frivolous courts good *religious manners* were as essential, in this period, as other courtly formalities; it was not difficult to assume that heavenly requirements were somewhat similar.

---

[31] *Ibid.*
[32] Brémond, *Le Sentiment Religieux,* I, 383.
[33] *The Progress of the Soul,* stanza xxxiii.

Polite piety coupled with easy morals was however the brighter side of this picture. Where piety is fashionable in the highest and most polished social circles, hypocrisy may develop the choicest flowers of finesse.

> Onyphrus has for his coverlid only a blanket of gray serge, but he sleeps upon cotton and down; in the same fashion he is dressed simply, but comfortably, which is to say, with a material very lightly cool in summer, and softly warm in winter: he wears shirts of delicate fineness which he gives himself considerable trouble to keep well hidden. He does not say *my sackcloth* and *my devotional discipline* . . . he so acts as to make one presume that he wears a sackcloth and is given to the practice of discipline.[37]

---

[34] Qui se repent du mal, il est presque innocent

[35] Certes, j'ai fait du mal, mais j'ai fait du service;
Que l'un se recompense et l'autre se punisse,
Soyez juste au loyer autant qu'au chatiment.

[36] Jadis un puissant roi differa de surprendre
Un lieu qu'il assiegeait, de peur de mettre en cendre
Un tableau dont les traits honoraient une tour;—
Conservez, o grand Dieu, votre vive figure
Peinte dedans mon cœur, par votre pur amour.

These three quotations from a poem of Bertaut, quoted by Brémond, *Sentiment Religieux,* I, 374-375. "Les dévots ne connaissant de crimes que l'incontinence, parlons plus précisément, que le bruit ou les dehors de l'incontinence," La Bruyère, *Les Caractères.*

[37] La Bruyère, *Les Caractères.*

Tartuffe, attempting the seduction of his friend and benefactor's wife, assures her that he cannot look upon her without being drawn to admiration of the Author of nature.[38] None touched the grandiose pretense of this century upon so many sides as did Molière, the creator of Tartuffe; and the masterpiece of hypocrisy is perhaps the scene in which this hero, overheard and betrayed to the husband, goes down upon his knees, confessing himself so completely as the vilest sinner, his whole life a mass of crimes and dirt, for which he calls down heaven's punishment upon himself and begs his friend to drive him from his house, that the husband's wrath is turned against the accuser, who would so vilely attempt to blacken the character of so pious a man.[39] Such subtlety of hypocrisy is as baffling to us as it was to Orgon. It betrays the perfect actor, so completely in his part that one is forced to believe the treacherous intention and its confession of equal sincerity.

The ideal of *humility* had been put sadly out of joint by the Renaissance, and the Counter Reformation had made of it largely a disposition to accept the authority of Church and doctrine, cutting off as presumptuous all questioning or individual irregularity of opinion. François de Sales seems at times to counsel humility as a disposition not to expect of oneself a perfection so conspicuously lacking when one turned his regard upon others. In such an attitude one may glide easily from the virtue of humility to the virtue of charity. For "that gentleness" which left one "in the hands of God in a holy indifference," that "docility which rendered one supple and manageable," ready to be led in everything by his spirit, "was not incompatible with a certain warmth," and active temperaments, in charitable activities "conducted with prudence (*menagée par la prudence*)" might find such activities, not opposed to the gentleness of humility, but "on the contrary, an excellent means either to conserve what gentleness one had, or to acquire what one lacked." [40]

Charity so prudently exercised in the interest of putting on an attitude of gentle humility pleasing to God, might become largely negative and self-protective. But in its assimilation of the new metaphysics, religion had upon its hands, not only the problem of establishing a comforting inner sense of harmony between the instincts of the bodily senses and the aspirations inflamed by the imagination; which with the mystics became a sort of activity of love, moving between two fixed poles of God and Self. This problem was, like others already mentioned, complicated by the new vision of life and nature as activity and motion. Human activity, liberated by the Renaissance, had thriven for a while on the theory that activity was clash and combative struggle, and that this clash and struggle was creative. But men became wearied of such destructive clash, painfully conscious of disturbance wrought by counter purpose; while at the same time physics began to teach the harmony of motion in the material universe. In the light of this conception and the new metaphysics it inspired, the ideal of *charity* might develop with a new significance. One did not, according to this new ideal of charity, merely, or perhaps even most importantly, save one's own individual soul by works of charity. Instead charity became a sort of ultimate active force, a *soul-motion* which, linked however cumbrously with the physical machine of the universe, might make of charity a creative instrumentality; or, if one linked charity less profoundly with metaphysics, a sort of social oil, with the application of which life might glide more gracefully, bend or slip with lessened friction, among the roughnesses of its earthly sojourn.

---

[38] Molière, *Le Tartuffe,* Act III, iii.

[39] *Le Tartuffe,* Act III, vi.

[40] *Un Ouvrage . . . de la Grande Mademoiselle,* cited above, 17-19.

France, in the seventeenth century, had not only its François de Sales, but its Vincent de Paul, who externalized the love of God, of which the former wrote a treatise, as active labor among unfortunates of many sorts: galley slaves, the sick in public hospitals. Religious instruction was extended to rural countrysides; more care was taken of the education of the parochial clergy. His *Sisters of Charity* are still at work among the sick and poor in every country where Roman Catholicism is found.

But if one wishes to find a classic seventeenth-century book of piety, to set as the objective contrast to the subjectivistic tendency of François de Sales' *Introduction à la Vie Dévote,* and emphasizing charity in the new context, one may turn to the deeper currents of latitudinarian Protestantism in England, and to the *Rule and Practice of Holy Living* (with the companion work on *Holy Dying*) of Jeremy Taylor.

> He who would die well and happily, must in his lifetime, according to all his capacities, exercise Charity; and because Religion is the life of the Soul, and Charity is the life of Religion, the same which gives life to the better part of man which never dies, may obtain of God a mercy to the inferior part of man in the day of its dissolution. . . . Charity is the great channel through which God passes all his mercy upon mankind.[41] Love is as communicative as fire, as busy and as active.[42]

The whole context of this thought links with conceptions discussed in the preceding chapter. Love is here, not a sentiment, a disposition, an attitude merely. Love is *busy, active, communicative.* It moves, and sets things in motion. Reducing two of his steps to one, *charity is the life of the soul.* And when he adds that charity is the *channel* through which God's activity affects mankind, love finds a place in the physical speculation of the time. Love moves and directs inert material in accordance with the great harmonic scheme of God. Jeremy Taylor might have found it hard to believe that he and Spinoza were attacking the same problem, with much the same sort of interest. Here too, the relative goodness, or badness, of Leibnitz's *best possible world,* is by direct implication made dependent upon human activity, exercised in the spirit of Christian charity.

Taylor is not interested in the metaphysical problem involved, but passes to a long list of works of charity. But when he says "God himself is love, and every degree of Charity that dwells in us is the participation of the Divine Nature," [43] love becomes in a new sense at once the *natura naturans* of Spinoza's terminology; and the goal of the mystic's pilgrimage. The mystic's love tended to be an intercommunication between God and the mystic. Here love, in a sense, is fed from behind, while its face is turned toward mankind. At the same time religion becomes, in a sense, a solution of the problem which worried the occasionalists; and love a sort of insurance against injury to God's universe, as a result of human activity. And so too, love becomes the one substantial virtue, in an age which split soul from body. Chastity and temperance were bound up with the body. Faith looked toward an end, in the achieving of which it would be swallowed up. Love is that activity which works with God, and is therefore as eternal as his operation. And so Taylor may say, with more consistent underpinning even than Paul, "When Faith fails, and Chastity is useless, and Temperance shall be no more, then Charity shall bear you upon wings of Cherubim to the eternal mountains of the Lord." [44]

---

[41] *Holy Dying,* chap. ii, iii.

[42] *Holy Living,* chap. iv, viii.

[43] *Ibid.,* II, iii.

The humility of monastic development and the heroic pride of Stoic ideal had after all much in common; each in its way an armor against the world, the flesh and the Devil. This new attitude subordinated humility, emphasizing, not the disciplining but the activity of a will converted. So it might have seemed possible to solve the problem of living "altogether in the world" an "altogether spiritual life." All the tragic sting, the essential ironic conflict exemplified in the life of Jesus seemed laid aside, as one imagined an Anglican clergyman, with a modest living assured, going about in patient confidence doing good works. Here again, though not precisely in the way we have noted earlier in the chapter, Christianity might move in the more suave atmosphere of the seventeenth century. But the matter was not to be so simple, either as François de Sales or Jeremy Taylor hoped. Suavity might slip on silks and satins—here again the gloves and girdles of the later Middle Ages. Silks, satins, gloves, and girdles might thrive on suavity, but they were neither made nor bought and sold by charity. Suavity was after all the thing that mattered. For the buying and wearing of those silks and satins with which one slipped through life "altogether in the world" charity might easily be found encumbering. With their making and selling it came more and more plainly to be seen incompatible. And so the seventeenth century was to slip toward the eighteenth, more suave certainly, better mannered, softer spoken, and of less extravagant gestures—but, more charitable? Underneath grew the antagonism brewing already for some two centuries or more, between those who made and sold the silks, satins, gloves, and girdles; and those who had learned to believe it their particular and perhaps exclusive prerogative to wear them fittingly and gracefully.

---

[44] *Holy Dying,* III, ii.

## LVI

Having traced some profound and some well-intentioned attempts to establish decency, order, good manners, and even charity in a religious world left so disturbed and troubled by the religious and political disorders of the sixteenth century, it is with some disillusion that one turns to movements of a little different character. We have previously dismissed disputes of quarrelsome theologians, on the ground that they did not represent the deeper religious trend of the seventeenth century. But, whether or not they represented this deeper trend, they had a way of becoming something more important than mere theological controversies. They were to mix, in England particularly during the seventeenth century, with the underlying questions of national polity, and perhaps even deeper still, with economic interests and issues which were to shape the world, and shape it even yet. We may then turn in brief consideration, to some of the difficulties of theology and church government bred by the Reformation, in order that we may note their general direction, before taking them into the deeper water of more immediate practical interest than that of eternal salvation.

One of the first difficulties Protestantism had upon its hands, as a religious movement merely, was the question of creed.

Medieval Christianity, save for universal recognition of such old traditional *symbols* of faith, such as the so-called Nicene and Apostles creeds, neither of which Protestants undertook to question, had known no question of creed. Not until the Council of Trent was any profession of faith, similar in purpose to the creeds which arose among Protestants, formulated in the traditional Church of the Middle Ages, and this Roman Catholic profession of faith was drawn to be subscribed to by the clergy only. While everyone is assumed to believe the same things about religion, the definition of what they believe is not felt to be important. Of course, during the medieval period, it cannot be said that everyone did believe the same, in matters of theology, but the assumption was always that they did. Indeed the bases of theological authority, so scattered between Bible, apostolic traditions, early Fathers, decrees of councils, theories of Scholastic philosophers, even papal bulls and programs never consolidated in very definite action or promulgated legislation, were matters to be disputed between learned doctors and canonists, and hardly more than that, unless they took such form in outward action, or practical teaching, as to inspire popular movements. No one dreamed, save a few of the theologians themselves, how much ground was left in which there was no clear and decided authority on one or another side of many matters of theological definition. Indeed, approaching the Council of Trent from the side of later Roman Catholicism, few things in that momentous council are more surprising than the amount of theological difference and dispute which had to be sidetracked, quashed, and silenced, by the authority of presiding officers. This matter we have not attempted to follow in sketching the history of this council, nor shall we here. It is enough to note that one fundamental question: that as to whether popes or general councils were the final authority in matters of doctrine, and one very popular belief—that in the immaculate conception of the Virgin—were left by this council to be decided in the nineteenth century.

Protestantism, as a protest, was bound to define its theological position. It forced some more definite formulation upon the older Church. But the definition of a reformed faith soon proved a very troublesome matter. The Augsburg Confession, which may stand as the first attempt of the Reformation to draw up a confessional creed, set before itself, at a time when the Protestant breach was not yet decisive, a conciliating purpose. It states that "the Church is the congregation of saints, in which the gospel is rightly taught, and the sacraments rightly administered." But already, in translating this *Confession* from Latin into German, the words were added "according to the gospel."

> In so much as the churches among us dissent in no article of faith from the Church Catholic, and only omit a few abuses, which are novel,

and contrary to the purport of the canons . . . the people ought not to be forced against their consciences to observe these abuses.[1]

The abuses cited were not few, but even these aside, as generally rejected by all Protestants, the formulating of confessions of faith soon proved more difficult than anyone suspected at the beginning. From the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries some twenty-five creeds may be assembled, each of which endeavors to establish the *true unity of the Church,* upon the right interpretation of the Gospel as to doctrine and sacraments. Nor is this all the difficulty. Several of these creeds required later amplification, all of them required some explanation, and all save a very few were the result of attempts to arrive at a common ground between differing factions, in which both sides believed themselves to have compromised something in the interest of broader unity. Indeed, the more assiduously attempts were made to define, the more these attempts developed and disclosed differences of opinion. Indeed these often acrimonious attempts might have suggested, more clearly than any other thing, the individual and personal nature of religious belief, which defied much precision in defining a common ground. It might have suggested, as it seems to have more or less unconsciously done in England, the wisdom of concentrating upon attempts to enjoin unity of habits of worship. If this seemed insufficient, about all that was left, it might have seemed, was to assent to the commonest criticism from Roman Catholics, that the only way to unite on doctrine was to accept it from authority, with no pretense as to its being a definition of personal religious conceptions of the faith.

However, the personalities and vagaries of individual faith were not the only difficulty. The assumption that authority for all religious doctrine was to be found in the Bible was another tremendous stumblingblock. It demanded the assumption that the Bible was *a book,* not a rather extensive collection of books, of authorship extending over many centuries. Attempts to harmonize differing religious conceptions in these different books was, if one admitted even an appearance of variation, a herculean task. But if one assumed the perfect harmony, refusing to take account even of appearance of discrepancy between different writings, this was merely to shift the variation from the books themselves, and place it among the books' interpreters.

---

[1] *Confessio Augustana,* Art. vii, "Of the Church"; and Part II, Introd. par.

The *variations* of Protestant faith soon became one of the most strongly emphasized points of Catholic apologetic as against the reformed faith, or faiths; and indeed these variations became disconcerting in number, and were all presumed to be based upon the same authority. And meanwhile theologians became so zealous in proving the validity of their different types of theology that they had no time or energy left with which to devote themselves to a more general study of those books upon which they believed their faith to rest.[2] Their study shifted from the Bible to the controversial explanation or defense of creeds, and universities set up professorial chairs for instruction in *theological polemics.*[3]

We need not follow these controversies. They centered, most generally, about two absorbing questions. The first of these questions was as to the manner in which God intended Christian congregations to be organized and governed. There were, in Protestant churches, bishops in fact and title, bishops more or less in fact without title, churches organized in national or smaller confessional groups, churches in which each and every congregation was essentially independent; and all of these forms because this was the way God intended his Church to be organized.

But the second question was of more absorbing importance, and vastly more complicated, since the forms of organization were more or less limited. This other question had been, as we have seen, brought forward particularly by Calvinism, but it soon drew in the Lutherans. The question was briefly this: Who is saved, and who is damned, and how did it all happen? [4]

Great and subtle are the complexities of the religious consciousness! Here was a new and strange Pelagianism, making it the task of each and every individual to save himself, in face of the great underlying Protestant dogma, that this was just the one thing the Christian could not do, since his salvation was the free and gracious gift of God. The Christian was not, to be sure, to save himself in ancient Pelagian fashion, by *works* and discipline of will. He was to earn the comfortable sense of salvation by discovering a formula, explaining the gracious act by which God tendered salvation to *some* human beings, in such a way as to set himself, even if alone, among the saved.

---

[2] In the years 1656, 1688, 1689, 1690, 1695, in the German University of Jena, not a single book of the Bible was commented upon in university lectures. Hettner, *Literaturegeschichte des 18tem Yahr,* III, 1, 24.

[3] *Ibid.,* same page.

[4] "In dieser Epigonzeit ist viel leidenschafter gekamft worden als in der Kirche des Mittelalters . . . hier aber steht jeder Einzelne im höchsten eignen Interesse in der Meinung, für sein ewiges Seelenheil einstehen zu müssen. Was das Christenthum noch sei, das ist in der Hingabe, an ein einzelnes Streitdogma fast vergessen worden," Von Hase, *Kirchengeschichte.*

> The theologians and Christian sectarians keep on continually disputing about the letter and form, while they care nothing for the spirit, without which the form is empty and the letter dead. Each one imagines that he has the truth in his keeping, and wants to be admired as a keeper of the truth. Therefore they denounce and slander and backbite each other. . . . So the Christians dance around their self-constructed fetiches, whom they call God, and on account of this fetichism they will not be able to enter the promised land.[5]

So wrote Jacob Boehme, a German mystic of these days. And all the time *he* had a secret, by which a man was not only to achieve a sort of mystic election, but more than that, to "distinguish everything that soundeth, stirreth, moveth or groweth, and judge of everything's virtual effect and original," learning to "bend them, use and manage them, according to his will, as pleaseth him." [6]

Of course these two absorbing questions, one as to the way God wished his Church to be organized, the other as to which formula could save any particular individual, did not go harmoniously together. According to one, all the saints should get together in a church. According to the other, any intelligent man, with a Bible and ability to read it, should be able to choose or devise some formula which made a saint of himself, and he could hardly be expected to choose or devise one which made saints of people with temperaments or theories with which he was not sympathetic.

---

[5] Quoted in Hartman's *Jacob Boehme,* 7.

[6] Boehme, *Concerning the Three Principles of the Divine Essence,* Preface (trans. John Sparrow).

Individuals and groups which took this sort of religion in a serious and uncompromising manner had a hard time finding enough like-minded persons to make a congregation, and even more difficulty in preserving this like-mindedness through closer association. The Brownists (who took their name from a Mr. Brown who had devised a formula) were such serious and uncompromising men and women "of warm spirits." Soon "half the congregation excommunicated" one of their number, who with some separating followers "returned the compliment to the others."

Smugness and cant throve in such an atmosphere. The very quintessence of Pharisaism hardly took pains to hide itself. Poor John Bunyan (of whom more later) in fear lest he had committed the unforgivable sin against the Holy Ghost, consulted "an ancient Christian," who listened to his story and told him "he thought so too." On further conversation Bunyan decided that this man, though good, was apparently "a stranger to much combat with the devil." [7] Bunyan does not recount his reasons for this conclusion, but the circumstances, together with Bunyan's keen eye for this vice of his time, suggest the picture of one of these smug canters, rather pleased than otherwise to narrow the circle of the Elect. Even the *Journal of George Fox,* founder of the Friends (or Quakers) scatters no small number of smug reflections.

> I never wronged man or woman in all that time; for the Lord's power was with me, and over me, to preserve me. . . . I used in my dealings the word Verily, and it was a common saying among those who knew me, "If George says verily there is no altering him" . . . but people had generally a love for me for my innocency and honesty. . . . The priest of Drayton . . . and another priest . . . would give place to me to hear me. He (the priest of Drayton) would applaud, and speak highly of me to others; and what I said to him on week-days, he would preach of on first-days, which gave me a dislike of him.[8]

Under these circumstances one is not surprised to discover that it made for peace and unity to have something besides the milk of true religion to urge men toward religious solidarity. In Germany there was the principle that citizens should everywhere accept the religion of the ruling prince. It was everywhere uncomfortable to live in a town where one did not agree with the theology preached on Sunday from the local pulpit, but principalities were small. To change to a more sympathetic religious atmosphere might mean nothing more inconvenient than a move to the next town.

---

[7] Bunyan, *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners,* par. xvi (in Oxford ed., with *Pilgrim's Progress*).

[8] George Fox, *Journal.*

It was in England where such religious tendencies were to link themselves with the broadest interests, and play the most conspicuous and significant rôle in European history. The particular character of the English Reformation of the sixteenth century pushed a reformation of another sort over into the seventeenth, and made of this country the nation of greatest religious strain and stress during this century. James I, after a very intimate experience in Scotland with the very determined Scotch type of Presbyterianism, began the seventeenth-century struggle in England with a settled conclusion that Presbyterianism and Stuart monarchy did not go together. His son, Charles I, with his political shiftiness, personal instability of purpose, no too great scrupulosity, and susceptibility to influence, had and maintained a persistent loyalty to the established Church of England. From this even the influence of an intriguing Roman Catholic wife, on whom he rather doted, could not move him. When Presbyterianism began to cross the border from Scotland, and gain influence in the House of Commons, it was to be expected that religion would play a part in political affairs. When later, as a determined struggle developed between King and Parliament, the assistance of Scotch armies was desirable, and English Presbyterians attempted alliance with Scotch; when armies were sent from Scotland to assist against the King, who kept up an intrigue with them, and even surrendered his person into their hands, as preliminary to his falling into the hands of the Independents of Cromwell's army, it is hardly strange that the Presbyterian angle of the struggle should have gained persistent reinforcement.

In consequence of this situation the Doctrine of Election became a convenient binding social force, and a substantial bulwark of unity in a political movement where practical interests were at stake. It was enunciated, in an assembly intended to establish Presbyterianism as the state religion, in 1647, in a form if anything a little more baldly and hardly stated than earlier in its career. In a chapter of the Westminster Confession of Faith, entitled, *Of God's Eternal Decree,* it is stated, with some abbreviation, as follows:

> III. By the decree of God—some men and angels are predestined unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death.
>
> IV. These angels and men, thus predestined and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number . . . cannot be either increased or diminished. . . .
>
> VI. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he . . . foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they who are elected . . . are redeemed by Christ . . . ; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed . . . called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only.
>
> VII. The rest of mankind God was pleased . . . for the glory of his sovereign power over his creature, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise ef his glorious justice.
>
> VIII. The doctrine of this high mystery . . . is to be handled with special prudence and care. . . . So shall this doctrine afford matter of praise, reverence and admiration of God; and of humility, diligence, and abundant consolation to all that sincerely obey the Gospel.[9]

But Presbyterianism in England and in Scotland were never to be the same thing. In Scotland the rulers of the Kirk were the zealots of the contemporary religious situation. The Scotch as allies against the king soon became dissatisfied with the Presbyterianism of Parliament. They called it Erastian,[10] suspected it of being interested in keeping ecclesiastical control in lay hands, and at the same time of allowing too great toleration to sects.[11] As for Charles I, he soon became convinced that Presbyterianism was but a way "to steal or force the crown from the king's head." When an assembly was called to erect it as the religion of the State, "Parliament kept its fingers on the whole conduct of the

---

[9] *Westminster Confession of Faith,* from Art. III.

[10] The theory more than once mentioned, which put the matter of religious faith and worship in state control.

[11] *Cambridge Modern History,* IV, 337-338.

Assembly's debate."[12] Presbyterianism, in the determination of Parliament, was to be no affair of zealots, but the middle-class middle way. Its temper is illustrated by a controversy which arose in London in 1645. A theological lecturer in a London church, supported by public subscription, was finally locked out of the church where he lectured, on behalf of these subscribers, because he disturbed the consciences of his hearers by advising them to make sure of their religion by personal investigation. "In the controversy which followed," writes Gardiner, "no stress was laid . . . on Scriptural argument for Presbyterianism. What was wanted was not a divinely appointed model of church government, but peace and quiet."[13] Conformity was still, as in the later sixteenth century, the issue. The shift from bishops to presbyters meant nothing so deeply as the fact that bishops were appointees of the king, and Parliament was determined to have peace, order, and conformity, under a church that they, and not the king, controlled.

Here, in order to understand what was happening in England, and what was later to happen to a lesser degree elsewhere in Europe, we must turn aside to note an alteration in the economic balance of this island nation.

It is hardly necessary to again recall the fact that feudal aristocracy was based upon the ownership of land. This was no less the case in England than elsewhere in Europe, but what was a little different in England than elsewhere was the fact that members of the middle class, having once accumulated a fortune, and having invested a considerable part of it in land, mounted rather easily into the class of nobles. This process had become conspicuous as early as the fifteenth century. We have already noted, also, that this class, whether or not titles had been acquired, were not temperamentally disposed to stand much nonsense on the grounds of religion, particularly where property rights were involved. During the sixteenth century, and the reign of Elizabeth particularly, trade and commerce increased rapidly. The balance between capital invested in land and in trade and commerce was considerably

[12] *Cambridge Modern History,* IV, 3.

[13] Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War,* III, 6 (chap. xxxviii).

altered. This movement continued over into the seventeenth century, and altered the temper even of the aristocracy.

An aristocracy of landlords, in truly feudal style, had few dealings with money. It came in as rent, it went out as expenditures, some to humor personal tastes, others to keep up a certain social position. There was little attempt to keep a balance between income and expenditure. If income did not meet expenditure the two expedients were, raising rents and borrowing money. With the rise to autocratic power of kings, these kings and ruling princes carried with them the traditions of the feudal nobility. For the most part they knew nothing, and cared hardly more, as to how and from where the money was to come which they spent. With the increase in luxurious living, and the decline in the purchasing power of money, which began as early as the thirteenth century, kings and princes were almost always in financial difficulties, and these difficulties increased. The peasant class first felt the burden of this situation. More and more was screwed out of them. But they could not meet all the increased expense of maintaining royalty and nobility. The more important nobles fell back upon the growing wealth of cities, but here it soon became, not a matter of exaction, but a matter of bargaining, in which the burghers understood bargaining better than the nobles. So wise princes began to choose advisers among the class who understood how to handle money, and to handle burghers who had it, and little by little the purse strings of the state slipped from the hands of potentates.

This situation developed earlier in England than elsewhere. Henry VIII maintained an autocratic power very largely by putting himself in a position where he was not obliged to ask for much money—he got his money from the Church largely, of which he made himself the head. Elizabeth got money when she needed it, by the two policies of being prudent as to what and when she asked, and by encouraging situations in which the moneyed class made money and were willing to divide their spoils with the sovereign. But here Charles I struck a snag. It irritated and humiliated his sense of dignity to be obliged to ask for money, and he lacked the persistence and depth of intrigue to scheme for it consistently. Instead he involved himself almost immediately in money quarrels with his Parliament. The Reformation in England had been little the affair of any interest of importance save that of the king and of the Church upon its medieval papal basis. But religion was still an important social motive power, and an important class hornlocked with the King, could hardly have neglected to look around for a religion with which to bolster their side.

The Scots were right in believing this the fundamental fact in English Presbyterianism. The religious enthusiasts seeking freedom to work out their various formulas of election and salvation were right in coming gradually to the conclusion that "new presbyter is but old priest writ large." A solid religious front was no less important now than ever it had been. Religious conformity was no less to be insisted upon. And so the *Solemn League and Covenant,* which was to unite English and Scotch Presbyterians against the King, aimed to bring about "an uniformity in the two countries, of religious faith and church government, according to the example of the best reformed churches and the Word of God."

But this attempt left aside the other absorbing problem of Protestantism: the natural right of every individual to choose or devise a doctrine of salvation electing himself and his favorite friends. And soon, to Episcopalian churchmen and Royalists, and to parliamentarian and other sympathizing Presbyterians, there was to be added a third faction, of Independents. These Independents, no matter upon what they might differ, had this upon which they could unite, in a situation that aimed to enforce religious conformity: a demand for toleration, not only for different types of individual and personal belief, but for worship and other social habits consistent with these different types of belief. Into the hands of this body of Independents passed the most effective armed sword. With this sword the forces of Charles I were dispersed. As early as 1647 it was making formal demands upon Parliament:

> Matters of religion and the ways of God's worship are not at all to be entrusted to any human power, because therein we cannot remit or exceed a tittle of what our consciences dictate to be the mind of God

without wilful sin; nevertheless the public way of instructing the nation (so it be not compulsive) is referred to their (*i.e.* the Parliament's) discretion.[14]

Into the hands of this armed force then fell the person of the king, and against him they executed the judgment of God. Then, under a leader of unusual force and statesmanship, a zealot of highmindedness and delicacy of conscience, whatever complicated motives, psychological indirections, and puzzling situations may have given basis for various interpretations of his character (Oliver Cromwell) these Independents had a short inning, in which an attempt was made to practice religious toleration. But, the Protectorate ended, the same question of conformity came almost immediately to the fore, and then it was proven how little difference it made to the class which had begun to exercise the real power, whether the nation were Presbyterian or Episcopalian. The bishops came back, and all the more zealously, because their incomes had been stripped very considerably during the Presbyterian period. Republicans had "lost their spirit," the bishops and their party "most of the greatest benefices in the Church," and the king was prevailed upon by the latter "to fix the terms of conformity on what they had been before the war," writes a contemporary.[15] At the outset of this controversy the king was prayed to suspend proceedings "against nonconformists in cases of liturgy and ceremonies" until some form of agreement might be reached, but steadily the screws were tightened,[16] leading to the last period of public religious persecution in England.

Underneath the more paltry elements of this struggle, there was something deeper developing: a strong sense of conflict between the Prince of Light and the Prince of Darkness. The Devil became, in England, a reality, potent and authoritative, and he was no longer wearer of a papal tiara. Underneath a struggle between conformists and nonconformists, more bitter, more clearly religious at least than ever before, the question of authority and toleration

[14] *The Agreement of the People, as presented to the Council of the Army,* IV, 1.

[15] Burnet, *History of His Own Times* (from book ii, First Part).

[16] From *Reliquae Baxterianae,* 241. Quoted in *Documents Relating to the Settlement of the Church of England by the Act of Uniformity.*

in religion was contested. The real struggle, however much it might hide in the question of Scriptural interpretation, was one for freedom of conscience in religion. In this struggle Milton fought, and in it he was persecuted. But for it the Satan of his *Paradise Lost* might never have been conceived.

> The mind is its own place, and in itself
> Can make a Heaven of Hell, a Hell of Heaven.
> What matter where, if I be still the same,
> And what I should be, all but less than he
> Whom thunder hath made greater.[17]

Change Satan to an imprisoned nonconformist, and God to a bishop, and the words might still remain the same, for it was the bishops who wielded the thunder for a time after 1662. In a sense Milton himself changes the places for us in his *Samson Agonistes,* where Samson, in a final trial of strength, pulls down the roof of the temple upon his captors and himself.

Out of this same struggle between conformists and nonconformists, in its last stage of deep and vital importance, arose one religious experience which was to set the problem of salvation in a new setting. Here the Bible was to be very important, but no longer as authority for forms of church government, nor for formulas of election. It was to become, in a Puritan setting, again a work of inspiration, a gospel of salvation, the guide to a way of life. This experience was that of John Bunyan, and it was to mold *Pilgrim's Progress,* a book to be read, for the period of considerably more than a century, by more English-speaking people than any other book, save the English Bible, and the Book of Common Prayer.

Perhaps no one of the great popular books of English literature (also by accident a masterpiece of that literature) has been so conspicuously pushed aside from the interest of the very class which fed upon it. Its content no longer touches, comforts, or inspires any vocal element of the poorer classes, who fed upon it, by millions, for far more than a century. Its effect however remains, though unconsciously. One is inclined to risk a statement that no one thing drove so effective a wedge between the battle of salvation, whatever its form or mode of expressing itself, among the poorer classes in English-speaking countries, and the authority of religious institutions, as Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress.* If the Revolution of 1688 was to set kings and Church where the ruling class wished them to be, *Pilgrim's Progress* put the Church more or less where it was wanted by the poorer classes. Matters of ceremony or of church government could never again be so important to them as they had been. One might go to church, to chapel, or to meetinghouses as he chose; the battle of salvation was not essentially in any of them. It was now left but to disturb *faith* in the individual conscience, and that, in England, even the eighteenth century was to little touch, among the humbler people.

---

[17] *Paradise Lost,* book i.

Bunyan left a record of his early life and conversion: *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners.* It is at once an interesting commentary of the religious atmosphere of his day, and a document showing how Bunyan pushed through this atmosphere to something of the heroic of earlier religious conversion experiences. Though both passionate and susceptible, Bunyan had a clear common-sense judgment, and a spiritual discernment which pierced sham and sophistry. A little differently conceived *Pilgrim's Progress* might have been made a masterly satire upon his age. And so, in stages of his conversion, we find him picking up, and discarding, some cant or trapping of his time.

> I fell in very eagerly with the religion of the times; to wit, to go to church twice a day, and that too with the foremost. . . . I was so overrun with the spirit of superstition, that I adored, and that with great devotion, even all things (both the High-place, Priest, Clerk, Vestment, Service, and what else) belonging to the Church . . . had I but seen a priest (though never so sordid and debauched in his life) I should find my spirit . . . reverence him. . . .[18]

He was long haunted by the fear that he had committed "the unforgivable sin against the Holy Ghost," although he could not guess what precisely this sin might be. A strange fear, hardly healthy, and yet Bunyan pushed through it, with some rather acute thought for an absolutely uneducated man, along the way.

---

[18] *Grace Abounding* . . ., par. 16.

> The Tempter would also much assault me with this, How can you tell but that the Turks had as good Scriptures to prove their Mohamet the Saviour as we to prove our Jesus is? . . . Every man doth think his own religion rightest, both Jews, and Moors, and Pagans! and how if all our Faith, and Christ, and Scriptures, should be a Think-so too? [19]

His conscience-difficulties go straight, in a homely way, and in Puritan dress, to big issues in common-sense questionings. He imagines God reflecting: "This poor wretch doth hanker after me as if I had nothing to do with my mercy but to bestow it on such as he." [20] Again, and this time it is Satan, not God, who speaks: "I will cool you by degrees, by little and little." [21] Election didn't always spoil by cooling, but this Satan did not appear to know. Temptations came to him with a vivid concreteness which molds clear images:

> I could not eat my food, stoop for a pin, chop a stick, or cast my eyes to look on this or that, but still the temptation would come, Sell Christ for this, or sell Christ for that; sell him, sell him.[22]

We need not accumulate quotations. The important matter to note is that here is another important conversion experience, and that it is accomplished, one might say, with no machinery whatsoever. Here is no cloister, no studied asceticism, no spiritual director, no mystic speculation, no yearning for dissolution in the eternal. It knows nothing of theology, has cast aside ceremony, does not contemplate nature in any comprehensive sense. It is a drama of salvation, in Puritan clothing of the seventeenth century, which seems none the less to escape the pitfalls into which Puritanism was always in danger of falling. It is hard on no one but himself, knows neither smugness nor cant: a zeal carrying a flaming torch, ready to set a fire alight anywhere, without preliminary questions. It set a humble poor man in the drama, without any intervening institution whatsoever. He was, like Pilgrim in his allegory, alone with a scroll. The scroll was, to be sure, the Bible, but not the Bible to be used, nor could he have used it, in the predominate manner of post-Reformation Protestantism.

---

[19] *Ibid.*, par. 97.

[20] *Ibid.*, par. 109.

[21] *Ibid.*, 135.

[22] *Ibid.*, same par.

It will be for us to note, in a later chapter, how that Pilgrim came to cast aside his scroll, when he had already cast aside all other machinery of religious quest.

## LVII

It is hardly necessary to-day to emphasize relations between religion and abnormal psychology. Religion having for long embraced the entire fields of philosophy and of science, having passed through a period when speculation was inclined to relate it closely to the arts of imaginative creation, has come gradually to be interpreted more and more in the light of the vagaries of neuropathology, and the hallucinations of hysteria and insanity. We need not pause to reflect upon such interpretation. This however few observers can fail to note: that psychopathology does often luxuriate in religion, and hallucination is almost more likely to take a religious than any other form. The apparent psychology of the most common, and also in many respects the most puzzling type of insanity (*dementia præcox*) makes it appear by no means strange that this should be the case. Religion which ceases to be a mere attempt to effect magical results, links with moral values and with more or less clearly imagined aspirations. Its very faith becomes confidence in the ultimate reality of such forms and formulations as it creates. It is therefore almost inevitable, in so far as religion does not fall into some formality of conventional gesture, that it balance delicately between creative aspiration and neurotic retreat. Here too it balances with artistic creation, and with the more universally distributed erotic complex. Not this only, but religion in any developed state has always established with a broad, if not universal, social distribution, patterns, symbols, images, forms of words, which are often the readiest of all resources for baffled or frustrated impulses, of the formative creative energy which is a healthy part of almost all emotion, and is most broadly displayed in the *play instinct* of children, or of the universal erotic urge for which the bases lie universally in the animal organism, intimately connected with all that affects emotional stimulation.

The neurotic element in religion connected itself with many forms, habits, and institutions of Christianity, at different times; perhaps one might say, with some of them at all times. But, during the seventeenth century, it is in connection with witchcraft and superstition regarding the Devil that religious pathology most particularly displayed itself.

Sick nerves, however, were but one element in the phenomena of witchcraft, and in the persecution of witches, in this century. Were it possible to lay against the majority of any one age the charge that they were neurotic, it would be difficult to absolve that majority from the same charge in any age. The majority of public opinion adapts and adopts systems of ideas which some complex or another pushes prominently before their consciousness. This adoption is hardly a matter of conscious choice. That suggestibility which is a prominent element in hysteria is also a universal human characteristic. The reasonable, in the broad popular sense, is little more than the direction in which popular reaction pushes most strongly. In the seventeenth century, so defined, witchcraft was reasonable. Different persons might draw the line in different places, as to what witches could and could not be believed to actually accomplish, but few indeed, even among the most intelligent and learned, had the hardihood to deny to demons and witches all power whatsoever. During the later sixteenth century an eminent physician, Jean Wier, who enjoyed the title of *Médicin du Duc de Clèves,* composed a long and learned treatise on devils, magicians, witches and poisoners,[1] in which he gave it as his opinion that witches were most often but insane, and that no confidence could be placed in their confessions or testimony.[2] He even went so far as to say that it was "much better to pardon ten culpable, than that one innocent should be put to death."[3] But such opinion was less than an outright denial of all witchcraft, and it was moreover swamped in opinion not less learned and respectable. "We are much obliged to Wier and those of his party," writes an active and convinced inquisitor, "who tell us that such things are but imagination and tomfoolery." [4] Another, of eminence quite overtopping that of Wier, since he was a learned economist and adviser of Henry III of France (Jean Bodin), declares [5] that it is impertinent to question the culpability of sorcerers, when it was affirmed "by the Twelve Tables, by lawyers, by emperors and the whole population, with their legislators, in Persia, among the Jews, Greeks, Latins, Germans, French, Italians, Spaniards, English."

---

[1] *Histoires, Disputes, et Discours des Illusions et Impostures des Diables, des Magicians infâmes, Sorcières, et Impoisoneurs; des Ensorcelez et Démoniaques, et de la Guerison d'iceux; etc.* Reprint, Paris, 1885.

[2] *Ibid.*, II, 249.

[3] *Ibid.*, II, 286.

One is therefore not dealing only with abnormal neurotic behavior in considering the preoccupation with witchcraft and demons which reached its climax in Europe in the seventeenth century. One is dealing rather with that moment when winds and storms of opinion and social impulsion had whipped together a great wave of social hysteria, in which the most normally acting persons were carried along. One has also to deal, toward the latter part of this century, with the breaking of that wave; as the same forces of law and order which had instituted the persecution of sorcerers, in fear of their power to work actual harm with curses and incantations, discovered in the hysteria of witch baiting itself a situation more troublesome than the harm the witches had been judged capable of working, and veered round to check and abolish witch persecution. The moment the witch persecution became so popular as to be a social nuisance, rulers, legislators, and other political administrators, began to consider and examine the whole matter more coldly. Then the Jean Wiers and other rare individuals who had written against witch persecution began to be listened to. The movement was checked, dissipated; it became less and less respectable, limited to out of the way corners, and sporadic outbreaks of general disorder; finally that very mass of the public which had cried "Burn the witches!" began to cry instead that belief in witchcraft was but foolishness.

Such, in brief, was the course of the hysteria as a popular movement, at the height of which the burning of witches appeared, to the most normally acting sort of persons, an entirely reasonable proceeding. But we have anticipated, and must turn back to contemplate the thickness, and something of the color, of the social atmosphere in which witches and their persecutors struggled.

---

[4] Barthelmy à Spina.

[5] Jean Bodin, *Démonomanie des Sorcières.*

Witchcraft, belief in it, recourse to it, consciousness of it appears to have grown so steadily during the later Middle Ages that one can hardly fail to look upon it as a social symptom. Currents of social unrest, discouragement, lost confidence and panic fear which marked the break-up of this world-order have already been traced. In so far as witchcraft and demonology were concerned, the humanistic enlightenment by no means clarified the murky air in which Thomas Aquinas believed demons to operate. On the contrary the Renaissance thought which emerged along with the disruption of the Scholastic systems was networked with strands of magical superstition. The growing cry was for gold! gold! gold! There were more ways to use it than there had been, and there was also more complication in getting it. Imaginations were inflamed with new possibilities, at the same time that economic pressure increased. People no longer rested in the medieval patience with social conditions, and acceptance of social patterns. They looked to see things happen, that they wished might happen; and if other means failed, they were not slow to try magic and sorcery. Astrology became a respectable element of learning in the fourteenth century, and as late as the second quarter of the seventeenth century Charles I availed himself of it, unsuccessfully, in an attempt to gain advance knowledge as to what horse would win at Newmarket races. In this century obscene exorcism was apparently practiced upon the King and Queen of Spain, to remove an enchantment which had left their marriage barren. In the late sixteenth century a respectable list of German princes, headed by the emperor (Rudolph II) maintained their court alchemists. Even Richelieu made an unsuccessful trial of their power, as means of replenishing the too meager purse of Louis XIII of France. Early in the seventeenth century a secret brotherhood was formed, on the basis of a tradition claiming to be centuries old, and more particularly enunciated by one Christian Rosencreuz in the fourteenth century. This society, known as the Rosecrucians, gained many noble and royal supporters; was indeed at its beginning almost exclusively aristocratic.

The founder of this order was believed to have had many prior incarnations, previous to his appearance as Christian Rosencreuz. In one of them he had appeared as Francis Bacon, in England. Among his various activities, in successive incarnations, had been collaboration with the alchemists. Between the occult practices of this brotherhood, with its secret initiation and esoteric doctrines, and the more vulgar witchcraft, aristocratic devotees doubtless drew distinctions, but common opinion credited them with powers and practices very similar to those of sorcerers. They were supposed to sign pacts with the Devil, to transport themselves in an instant from place to place, to be capable of rendering themselves invisible, to prepare with magic formulas enchanting potions and philters, and to possess the ability to read the thoughts of others.

Indeed, by the beginning of the seventeenth century, a considerable measure of preoccupation with magic, demons, and witchcraft had filtered into all classes of society. So general was belief in incantations "which seemed to put life and death under the control of dealers in astrological certificates and magical charms," that it is suggested such beliefs influenced the reckless conduct of the soldiery, and also that of the unfortunate populations which they wrecked and ravaged, during the Thirty Years' War in Germany.

An important factor in creating this psychological atmosphere, out of which arose the mad panic of witch baiting, was the invention of printing. Previously magical manuscripts had been treasured, secretly and sparsely, very largely in monastic libraries, where monkish physicians might pore over them. But, with the invention of printing, treatises concerning magic practices, old writings previously existing in manuscript form, with cabalistic signs and formulas of enchantment, with which were mingled some of the infant babblings of chemistry, began to pass more widely, even though still *sub rosa.* But more important were the pamphlets prepared for popular consumption. Accounts of witch performances, and of witch trials and the testimony elicited, scattered broadcast. They could not, like books of magic, be suppressed, for they treated of social enormities and their punishment. They passed, as the witch persecutions themselves, as a vehicle of condemnation, and might claim the same sort of immunity as modern journalistic accounts of murder trials, or divorce proceedings. Of course they were not interested in weighing or sifting the reliability of testimony. They throve upon the sensational elements of witch behavior, emphasized the marvelously spectacular, doubtless invented many elaborations to feed the contemporary itch for thrills. They not only fed the popular fear of witches, but attracted many toward the practices of the witch cult.

To what extent an organized witch cult existed, with fixed ritual and recognized officers, with something of the solidarity of a widespread secret religious order; or how much this order and organization was the elaboration of those who fed the popular panic and curiosity, and how much the mere phantasies of imaginations "bewitched" by a dreaming fascination exerted by the idea of such assemblies, remains a matter of considerable uncertainty. In a measure the Inquisition contributed to the establishment, in the popular imagination at least, of such a cult, in turning persecution formerly directed against such heretical sects as the Cathari and Waldenses, who had been obliged to hold meetings secretly in the woods and other out-of-the-way places, against the witches, and perhaps assuming similar organization and secret rites.[6]

But, out of the tangle of various influences, in some districts at least, there apparently did come to be *witch bands* of some organization, under a *coven* of practiced witches and wizards, who arranged assemblies from time to time of various purpose, which assemblies assimilated, as four *sabbaths,* to old ideas connected with the seasonal cycle and age-old fertility rituals.

The witch ceremonies, held in the woods at night about some sacred tree or phallic stone, were said to center about a *mass* at which an incarnate devil officiated. Wild dances and orgy, stimulated by good ale and stronger *eau de vie,* drew doubtless many curious to a wild party, about which an atmosphere receptive of almost anything easily accumulated. Important witch personages rode to these assemblies on broomsticks through the air; the Devil was present in person at all important gatherings, and when they met in some house to feast a place was set for him at the head of the table. He was fond of merriment and pretty women. An item of testimony as to one of these feasts sets the scene:

---

[6] Kittredge, *Withcraft in Old and New England,* chap. xvi, discovers no evidence of witch bands or sabbaths in England before 1612, and rather minimizes their reality.

> They went to Mary Rynd's house and sat doune together at the table, the divell being present at the head of it; and some of them went to Johne Benny's house, he being a brewer, and brought ale from hence . . . and others of them went to Alexander Hieche's and brought aqua vitae from thence, and thus made themselves mirrie; and the divell made much of them all, but especiallie of Mary Rynd, and he kist them all except the said Helen herselfe (from whom the testimony), whose hand onlie he kist. . . .[7]

The formal ritual of their ceremonies appears to have been a strange mixture of elements borrowed from surviving anti-Christian practices and parody of Christian ceremony. Such latter was their mass; and there was likewise a sort of baptism, in which the children of the devotees were devoted to Satan. Their feasts began with a grace in which the Devil was thanked for the food set before them, though often they had brought it themselves to the feast, and many testified that what they ate at such feasts had no taste. But older elements included the sacrifice of an animal victim, from which more probably than from the infant sacrifice of which they were accused grew the common belief that children were killed, roasted and eaten at the witch festivals. The same charge was brought in pagan times against Christians, and later by Christians against Jews. There appears to be some fascination of horror aroused by the idea of infant sacrifice which fastens this accusation upon any hated sect.

One element of the witch ceremonies and assemblies was undoubtedly the old spirit of carnival orgy, driven from cathedrals

[7] Murray, *The Witch Cult in Western Europe,* 141.

and city market places into village cottages, and the depths of the midnight woods. The deep-seated licentious desires, the hidden instincts to see ordered society for some hours topsy-turvy, the Devil in the place of God, the bond of convention broken, were liberated under the spell of religious enthusiasm. There were doubtless those who exploited this whole complex with a certain measure of cold blood. He who played the Devil in such bands or assemblies, and was believed to be his incarnation by the devotees, enjoyed many privileges, among which might be coveted that of possessing every woman in the band. Religious cults in which the deified or priestly chief possesses this prerogative have never yet been entirely eliminated from society, either above or below stairs.

But it was not only what witches and witch devotees did, or believed themselves to do, that was at this time important. The things which they were expected to do, or credited with having done, was of quite equal importance. Persons who had never attended a sabbath of the witches, who never had perused a book on magic and sorcery such as fed some curious imaginations, knew precisely what to expect of those whom demons in one way or another possessed. In consequence, not only might any personal misfortune be laid to the charge of someone who was personally disliked, or merely socially believed to be "a little queer," but these unfortunate *queer* persons themselves found no explanation of their queerness so ready as the belief that they were bewitched. On one side it might give them a certain importance, which they might even at times exploit. On the other it turned loose repressed impulses to vagaries of action, which to-day might rather inspire some strange work of neurotic semicryptic art. To play the bewitched left freedom to run amuck. Neuroses generally harmless, even erotic crises of adolescence or shock of temporary character, were loosed as manias.

And so, whatever the substantiality of the witch cult, many of the saddest tragedies of demonic possession and witch persecution, were those in which neither witch cult, witch, or witchery played any part whatsoever; but rather some possibly slight, perhaps temporary, and usually harmless hysterical derangement, the nature of which is often very clearly shown in the testimony elicited at the trials of witches, and of others believed to be possessed against their will by demons.

One of the latter sort of cases, which fortunately ended, at least so far as public interest was concerned, with the driving out of the devils which possessed the poor victim, and her consequent cure, testifies to the effect of prevalent information respecting the Devil and his activities, not only upon an hysterical serving maid, but upon the whole community interested in her case.

The complicated condition of mingled fascination, of fear, of shame, and of released repressions, occasioned by a brutal attack made upon her by some soldiers, bred in the ignorant, hysterical, and doubtless starved psyche of one Françoise Fontaine, toward the end of the sixteenth century, the conviction that the Devil had chosen her to be his mistress. The house in which she had taken service became haunted; many strange happenings and noises resulted. Toward midnight the whole military guard stationed in the town of Louviers was aroused, hurried before a certain house, only to learn that it was not an earthly enemy who had caused the disturbance, but "a spirit, which had come into the house of the said le Gay, who tormented strangely the wife of said le Gay . . . even the servant." [8]

So was initiated a long process, involving the imprisonment of said servant, who, thus placed under durance of greater fear and where her actions might be observed, gave strange and evident signs of her demonic possession. In the course of her trial she finally made confession that

> Quelques temps aprèz la prinse dudit Louviers pour le service du Roy, aucuns soldatz de la garnison auoient prins et enleué Françoise de force, laquelle ilz auoient forcés et viollée; pour raison de quoy, elle s'estoit désesperé.[9]

A persistent and commendable effort was made to exorcise the demon which possessed her, and after long confinement in the church, many masses, and finally the shaving of her hair, she having upon the occasion of one of the visits of her satanic paramour presented him with some combings of her hair, which he wished as a love token, resulted in her rehabilitation.

---

[8] *Procès Verbal fait pour délivrer une Fille Possédée par le Malin Esprit, etc.* Benet et de Moray, 2-3.

[9] *Ibid.*, 31-32.

Subsequent to the Middle Ages the line between heaven and earth came to be less distinctly drawn. Medieval mystics, such as Peter Damiani, drew together all the emotional and imaginative elements in the amatory complex and in a crude but heroic effort of emasculation projected them toward heaven and the Virgin, while Mechtilde of Magdeburg and other feminine mystic saints dreamed of the mystic marriage in which the bridegroom was Christ. But, particularly under the influence of the *Spiritual Exercises* of Loyola, the office of the confessor had become one more personally intimate, and less the externalized fulfillment of a mechanical function. Also, as a result of the printing and general distribution of manuals of devotion of various authorship, the moral consciousness had been refined and complicated. The medieval period had its well-ordered and its disordered convents always, the preponderance altered from period to period, as too common and obvious decadence occasioned recurring waves of reform. But, by the seventeenth century, the passion of love had attained a more subtle ideal ambiance. People discoursed concerning *platonic love.* Sentimentality wove the most intricate patterns of polite courtship; the whole geography of a *pais du tendre,* with rivers of tears and mountains of hope, might be, and was mapped actually.[10] Long romances, almost endless, traced the complicated course of love's languishings. But all passion could not dissipate in such precious pastime.

At the same time celibate clerics, as confessors and spiritual advisers, came to play a larger rôle in the religious life of feminine religious communities, into which fine-grained maidens had precipitated themselves often at the moment of adolescent crisis. It was by no means always possible to maintain, upon the plane of such a relationship as that between François de Sales and the widowed Madame de Chantal, relations between maidens, likely to be among the hysterically inclined, often of tempting beauty, and confessors of no particular pretension to ascetic discipline. When, into this delicate situation, there was further introduced an extreme consciousness of the wiliness and the compulsive power of Satan, entrusted in human beings in some diabolic pact, by which unlimited knowledge and forbidden pleasures were assured, trouble might easily result. Baffled instincts, the sense of sin and impending damnation, hysteria, jealousy, fear, fascination, erotic imaginings, might work out in feminine psychology more delicate than that of a serving maid, strange complications, that might in the end give some victim to the witch's bonfire.

---

[10] As in the romance of Madame Scudéry, *Le Grand Cyrus.*

Sometimes such a situation might be exploited, and a confessor, himself enmeshed in a complication of passion and superstition and exploitation, might work havoc in a community of nuns. This seems to have been the situation in the celebrated case of Urbain Grandier. But a web of similar circumstances might also enmesh a cleric, very fleshy, but apparently innocent of any attempt to practice arts of sorcery.

Such appears to have been the fate of the unfortunate Abbé Gaufridy, burned at the stake in Aix en Provence in 1611, whom one suspects to have been oversusceptible, not only to the charms of satisfying food and drink, but to those of his fair penitents, who lurked about the church to discourse with him often, toward sunset and the hours succeeding. It was not to any hysteria of his own that he fell victim, but rather to that of two nuns, both apparently in love with him, who turned their thwarted passion, their jealousy, their guilty consciences, against him, disrupting at the same time the peace of a small community of nuns, the larger part of whom, under the stress of this satanic visitation, developed strange and abnormal behavior.

Louis Gaufridy was of humble birth, but in him was something that made him aspire above the position of his brother, a journeyman tailor without a shop of his own, and not seldom lacking employment. Early in his clerical career he attained to the common table of the cathedral chapter at Marseilles, with hope of becoming a canon. Spiritual requirements were not exacting, judging by the punishments which might follow infractions of the disciplinary rules. The available income was distributed among the clerics supported at the common tables, mostly in kind (flour and wine) partly in money. The incumbents might be deprived of their share for a day or two, when they lacked reverence in the services: reading, for example, some private office while another public service was going on, or neglecting their ministrations to the sick, failing to appear to exercise some function, without having arranged for a substitute, or squabbling as to their proper place in a procession. For more serious offenses, such as wearing a ring, inviting relatives to the common table, going into the cathedral vineyard when the grapes were ripe, keeping in their chambers or loaning to others property belonging to the sacristy, entering taverns, or going through the streets at night without a lantern or bearing arms, playing cards or quarreling in the chapter house, they might be deprived for several days.[11]

Gaufridy was of a genial nature. He loved good food and drink, and pleasantries at table, such as drinking a good cup of wine, brimful, imitating meanwhile the sound of animals drinking,[12] or throwing playfully handfuls of soft cheese in the faces of women with whom he dined.[13] His feminine penitents were many, and often he would bring to the common chapter table some delectable morsel of food given him by one of them, to eke out the coarser common fare. They lingered in the church after nightfall to consult with him, visited him in his chambers. None the less he did not enter into chapter quarrels, nor render himself liable to punishments and deprivation of his rights in the distribution. The sins of the flesh were perforce to be pardoned where "it was impossible to dissimulate the fact that the way of life of these clerics (of Marseilles) was so far removed from their profession."[14]

---

[11] Loredan, *Un Grand Procès de Sorcellerie au XVII<sup>e</sup> Siècle,* 58-62.

[12] *Ibid.,* 64.

[13] *Ibid.,* 68.

[14] *Ibid.,* 62, quoted from the letter of a French ambassador to Rome in the period.

The Abbé became a familiar at the house and table of an excellent family of Marseilles; welcomed by Madame Demandolx, her daughter Madeleine, and others of her family chose him as their confessor. Madeleine, at the age of ten, announced her desire to enter the Order of the Ursulines. In arranging the financial preliminaries the Abbé Gaufridy acted as the go-between.

So Madeleine de Demandolx entered as pensionary the community of Ursulines at Marseilles, soon to be transferred to the house of the same community at Aix, a few miles distant. Some two years and a half later, a young girl, frail, blond, of thirteen and a half years, she fell ill. Gentle, timid, but vain and affectionate, she had been loved by companions and superiors alike. She had shown, even from her eighth year, signs of being drawn to religious devotion, and on arrival at Aix had asked for a cell apart, that she might practice in solitude her unusual asceticisms, had outdone all the rest in religious virtues, though one sister criticized "the ravishments which overcame her often in public."

On account of her illness she was removed to her home in Marseilles, where the Abbé Gaufridy had for long been an intimate. Restored to health she entered again the convent of the Ursulines, at Marseilles, this time as novice. It was perhaps about this time that her life became troubled by her feelings for her confessor. As for the Abbé himself, so far as one has a clear right to judge from the evidence, his conduct toward her may never have departed beyond the line of a rather free familiarity which he apparently allowed himself with all women. But soon Madeleine made confession to her mother superior of familiarities which shocked the good sister Gaumer. Madeleine was sent back to Aix. She became more and more continually ill. She trembled all over, and asked the cause replied that she thought of Louis Gaufridy, and her despair lest she never receive forgiveness and mercy troubled her. Before Christmas exorcism was tried. The trouble continued. Her behavior became more and more strange. It was contagious. Ten novices left the convent, unable to live in a community where, not Madeleine alone, but three of her companions as well, had developed strange behavior.

A little cavalcade, the prioress and her associates, two clerics, Madeleine, and another, Louise Capeau, who had apparently never seen Gaufridy, but burned with a strange and complicated spite against Madeleine, and had become possessed with a demon of her own, in a way which bound the fate of the two together, set off for a sacred grotto where another Madeleine, the Sainted Mary, had done years of penance after her arrival in Provence. The first period of exorcism there was short and accomplished nothing. When the second took place, shortly after, the net was already closing around Gaufridy. Inside the grotto a little company looked on, while the demon who possessed Madeleine threw a shoe at the demon who possessed Louise, the demon possessing the latter uttered prophetic words, other demons howled about the cave. Public curiosity had become aroused, and people began to arrive to look on. The words of the two possessed were taken down, but the demon of Louise talked so fast it was impossible to catch the words.

These demons, however, were not to be cast out by prayer and fasting, but by other means. The trial of Gaufridy began. First it was conducted by the inquisitor for the region. Much testimony was brought forward, with little convincing in it. Gaufridy was strung up, a stone tied to his feet. He stood suffering badly; was ready to confess anything if but released from pain, yet what he confessed was contradictory and hardly credible. One thing he consistently denied: guilty relations between himself and Madeleine de Demandolx. But the purpose was to extract a confession of diabolic practices. In the end, with the assistance of torture, enough was extorted to effect his condemnation. As a special privilege he was to be strangled the moment the fire was lighted. By some unaccountable intervention, interpreted as divine by some, the cord arranged to strangle him did not work, and the fire had its living victim.

After his death Madeleine appeared somewhat better, and continued for some time to live among the Ursulines of Marseilles. Then, because she was still troubled in spirit, though less violently now, her parents put her upon a farm. Upon the death of members of her family, she inherited money, and made some pious foundations. She went about laden with chaplets that rattled as she walked. People looked at her rather askance, some believing she worked magic against them. Despite some threatening events, nothing serious happened. In the end, poor now, she retired to a small village cottage where she died, still wearing the habit of the Ursulines.

As for Louise, after Gaufridy was burned she turned to prophesying against others, and a little orgy of witch persecution developed locally. At last, and younger, she also died, in the house of her parents, administering a sound slap to the Vicar who was performing the last rites. After this the Devil, "together with much filth," finally departed from her altogether, just before her death.

We have already noted the handing over of jurisdiction in matters of magic and witchcraft to the Inquisition, in Catholic countries, and how gradually the Inquisition itself largely escaped papal control. Bad as was the papal Inquisition, state control, together with the deterioration of the institution itself, was even worse. The charge of witchcraft was used for political purposes by the English to get Jeanne d'Arc out of the way.[15] At much the same time it was used, largely for family purposes, embracing the financial interests of an important noble house of Brittany, against Gilles de Rais, peer and Marshal of France, who became the Blue Beard of fiction.[16] But witch persecution could get on very well without the Inquisition, and the Reformation did nothing to check it in Protestant countries. Though the reformed had no Inquisition, they all possessed Bibles, in which might easily be found an Old Testament injunction, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live."

If anything the popular influence upon witch persecution was more prominent in Protestant than in Catholic countries, just as religious authority was more largely shared by all. There were several cases of rabid professional persecutors,[17] but the larger proportion of the excesses committed in Protestant countries were of popular origin, and wherever, in England for example during the middle of the seventeenth century, the hand of political authority became weak, generally or in some particular district, witch persecution was likely to break out.

---

[15] The most convenient account of the trial of Jeanne d'Arc, written since the publication of the papers and records of her trial, is that of Anatole France, *Vie de Jeanne d'Arc,* and its Eng. trans.

[16] Considerable study has been given to the rehabilitation of the reputation of Gilles de Rais. The records are reprinted in Hernandez, *Le Procès Inquisitorial de Gilles de Rais,* Paris, 1921.

[17] The notorious Matthew Hopkins, for example.

There was for a time a tendency to link closely the burning of witches and the Puritan temperament. This tendency is believed by some recent students to have been exaggerated.[18] However, the Calvinistic faith rather easily lent itself to the extermination of those, not merely reprobate, but actively engaged in promulgating the kingdom of Satan; and the record of Puritanism here is at all events scarcely edifying, or a perceptible part of any tendency to tolerance. Catholics at least went through a more determined form of attempting to cast out evil spirits. On the other hand, during the period when this social hysteria particularly flourished, the Roman Church was busy many places with problems of more permanent importance to its interests. One safeguard in Catholic realms, was the necessity of getting the bishop to institute proceedings. On the whole this was likely to be less easy than to move local authorities in out-of-the-way English communities, particularly in such revolutionary times as the seventeenth century.

The comparative ease with which charges might be brought caused many enormities. Many famous witch cases seem undoubtedly to have arisen in private spite. While witch baiting raged it was a dangerous charge for anybody to be accused of witchcraft. On the other hand there were times and places where, so long as all went well, there were advantages both social and economic in being credited with powers of witchery; which again might at any time have a dangerous recoil. Ignorant people everywhere, and many by no means ignorant, while willing to avail themselves of witch's powers, so long as they served, were ready, with the first turn of ill fortune, to denounce the identical witch to whom they had resorted previously.

Sensational tales of witch persecution in Old and New England have been so often exploited in history and fiction that we need recount none here. Skepticism, first as to the reliability of evidence, and then as to the reality of the witchcraft itself, increased rather rapidly toward the end of the seventeenth century. In the eighteenth century, before its first quarter had passed, political authority, now almost everywhere against witch persecution, drove it underground, as a no longer important social phenomenon. The tendency to resort to magic, and believe in the exercise of supernatural power to effect even malevolent ends, lies deep. Fortunately such combinations of circumstance as give broad active credence, or not less active social disapproval, of attempts to exercise such powers, are rarer occurrences.

---

[18] So Kittredge, *Witchcraft in Old and New England,* chap. xviii; and to a slighter degree, Notestein, *A History of Witchcraft in England,* 195ff.

# LVIII

> The Council of Trent had so happily terminated the religious question, that it seemed as if nothing could longer trouble the calm which the Church enjoyed, particularly in so far as the questions of grace and predestination were concerned. . . .[1] The clergy of France . . . were far removed from any sort of innovations; the Sorbonne counted doctors affectionately disposed toward the Papacy and strongly opposed to anything that might shock it. . . . Parliament was not ill-intentioned; the sad recollection of the condition to which the heresy of Calvin had reduced the state, still before their minds. The ministry was thoroughly conversant with religion and zealous to maintain it in purity. The Jesuits had the ear of the King and of the Queen Mother, whose consciences they directed.[2]

SUCH appeared to the Jesuit Father Rapin to be the religious situation in France toward the end of the third decade of the seventeenth century, while a doggedly patient Dutchman read and reread the works of Augustine, with the hope of resurrecting in the Roman Catholic Church the evangelical purity of doctrine mirrored in the early Fathers, and Augustine above all.

This Dutchman was Cornelius Jansen who, though born very poor, had managed to get an education at the University of Utrecht, under both Catholic and Protestant teachers. During his university studies he made the acquaintance of Jean du Verger de Hauranne, the son of wealthy and distinguished parents. The two together, Jansen in the field of theological speculation, De Hauranne (known later from the abbey of which he became titular head, as Saint-Cyran) in the activity of disciplinary reform, were to trouble this calm.

There were indeed others besides Jansen (whom we may call rather by the Latin form of his name he appears to have preferred, Jansenius) and Saint-Cyran, who saw this apparent calm less rosily than the Jesuit Rapin. Three others particularly, De Berulle, Vincent de Paul, and Bourdoise, had prayerfully met together in 1611 to exchange their views as to much needed reforms. The first had counseled a body of learned and exemplary preachers and teachers; the second, missionary work among the ignorant in the country districts; the third, disciplinary reform among the clergy generally.[3] There were, in short, conditions far from ideal among both laity and clergy. But there was also a sort of calm, the nature of which François de Sales had helped to establish in the realm of sentiment and inner religious experience; and which Jesuits and Dominicans conspired to assure in the intellectual sphere, by agreeing to unite upon a *single* theological term, and not insisting publicly that they privately defined this term in ways radically opposed.[4] There was also a certain calm in many Christian consciences, into which the Reformation had driven the struggles of religion, to a larger degree at least, both among Catholics and Protestants. In Catholic countries people studied their consciences with somewhat the same zeal that Protestants studied their Bibles. When a good Calvinist found a certain course of action prudent or advantageous, he might search, preferably the Old Testament, to find a fitting authority for the deed he wished to perform. When a fashionable Catholic noble wished to play his graceful part, according to the fashion of Versailles, he consulted his spiritual director, in order to discover just where and how an accommodation with conscience might be discovered.

---

[1] Rapin, *Histoire du Jansenisme, depuis son origine jusqu'en 1644,* 1.

[2] *Ibid.,* 210.

In this way casuistry developed as the art of calming consciences. Several persons, their inspiration generally attributed to the Company of Jesus, had written to the effect that, in order truly to sin, in such a way as to earn God's condemnation, a person must clearly perceive beforehand the sinful nature and consequences of the intended deed, and must persist in its accomplishment in the clear knowledge of its evil character.[5] The field of possible equivocation thus opened up was tremendous. God might indeed find it difficult to condemn anyone, save such as possessed a wisdom approaching his own, combined with a superhuman satanic willfulness of evil purpose. A Christian of proper humility might be led to ask whether it were indeed possible for anyone with mere human equipment to sin at all.[6]

---

[3] Sainte-Beuve, *Port Royal,* Discours Préliminaire.
[4] Pascal, *Les Provinciales—de la Grace Suffisante.*
[5] Pascal, *Provinciales—de la Grace Actuelle.*

The intention of Jansenius, having read and reread his Augustine, and having digested therefrom some conclusions as to the nature of *original sin, predestination* and *saving grace,* was no less than that of stirring to the very bottom of all this calm—emotional, intellectual, moral—by exposing in pages of a long treatise which he called the *Augustinus,* a contemporary Christianity very generally Pelagian or semi-Pelagian.

Pelagianism was bad enough, and against its presumptuous pride Jansenius has considerable to say. Between its vaunting doctrines, inspired by a revived interest in the Stoics, and a *reason* which vanity had corrupted and decadent Scholasticism had dressed and covered, there was, he believed, such secret accord that, but for divine grace and the authoritative teaching of Augustine, one could hardly escape its seduction.[7] But, in Pelagianism there was still something of the heroic, though it were but an heroic pride which must be attributed to Satan. Saving oneself by one's own effort, although an affront to the whole conception of a vicarious death of a divine Son for the inherited sins of Adam's descendants, was a task those who cared at all to undertake might hardly envisage as easy.

The poison of semi-Pelagianism was more insidious, and from the beginning had always been more popular, saving many from complete heresy when, in the fifth century, the Pelagian controversy raged. Watered down and spread thin for popular consumption, semi-Pelagianism easily became the comfortable feeling that one went along, doing what he conveniently could toward arranging for his eternal salvation, and since he might not hope, in the ultimate, to do all that was necessary, what he left undone the grace of God attended to.

---

[6] Pascal's *Provinciales* are the classic exposé of Jesuit casuistry of the period. He has naturally been accused of deforming what he attacked, by isolating "four words" from their context, etc. A modern authority discovers, however, that the isolation of the "four words" was not his, but taken directly from a Jesuit handbook on casuistry, "Nous n'avons plus le droit de dire . . . il est tendanteux: l'autorité d'Escobar le couvre," Strowski, *Pascal et son Temps,* III, 96ff.

[7] Sainte-Beuve, *Port Royal,* II, 110.

We cannot attempt to follow here the ponderous argument of Jansenius, nor the work of Arnauld, upon whom next fell the theological burden of the Jansenist movement. With Pascal, to whom we shall return, the underlying attitude of Jansenism assimilated new elements, and was at the same time largely stripped of its theological garments, and it will more repay us to glance at this final form of the intellectual expression of the Jansenist reform. But enough has been already said, as to certain comforting tendencies in seventeenth-century religion, to show that doctrines, whether Pelagian or semi-Pelagian, which bridged in a commodious way the breach between heaven and earth, had much to commend them to the religious temper of the period.

All this Jansenius disturbed. The cleft between earth and heaven became enormous. One could not cross it; he must be borne, transported. In the words of Jansenius, the soul was, upon this voyage, "a vessel stripped of oars and sails, exposed upon the great ocean of the divine will."[8] This sense of the overpowering discrepancy between earth and heaven, sin and salvation, finite ineffectiveness and infinite wisdom and power cast its shadow over, and lent, too, a serious profundity to, the whole movement of which he was one of the initial inspirers. Angélique Arnauld, of whom more hereafter, feared and shrank from the idea of death, almost to the very end of a long and saintly life. Pascal, who in an intellectual sense presided over the twilight of Jansenism, and of its monastic offshoot, Port Royal, brooded over this abyss, his imagination suspended in awe at the helplessness of the intellect before the conception of the infinite, as he contemplated a "new abyss," its immensity comprehended within the invisible space of an atom's extension, which atom became a universe, with its firmament, its planets, its earth, and on this earth beings, again atomically divisible, and so on, *ad infinitum.*[9]

To this speculative vision of the ineffectiveness of man's ability, as measured by his vision of God's overpowering greatness, to do other than fall back upon divine grace as his sole hope of salvation, Saint-Cyran contributed an uncompromising moral sternness, which held the vision clearly and persistently in the field of moral discipline. Here was a spiritual adviser who gave sin no quarter, and was as zealous in search of it as some others were in removing troubling fears lest it haunt them somewhere. A very rhetorical man of letters of the time wrote to him that he was "the greatest tyrant who existed in the world to-day." "But certainly," he continued, "there is pleasure in allowing oneself to be forced into happiness, and to fall into the hands of a man whose only violence is exercised for the good of those who suffer under it."[10]

---

[8] Sainte-Beuve, *Port Royal,* II, 118.

[9] Pascal, *Pensées,* sec. ii, 72.

Under this stern load of moral censorship the personal quality of Saint-Cyran's influence is easily lost. To assure ourselves that there was not only a force behind this disciplinary determination, but a personal charm which won people to him, one is almost obliged to reënforce his feeling that there must have been, by reviewing the variety of distinguished persons, both men and women, who were drawn to his influence. The piercing and critical eyes, which the portraits of Philippe de Champaigne reveal, could smile however, and the thin-lipped, firm-set mouth, which misses cynicism narrowly, does so none the less upon the kindly side, and about it there are no lines denoting sour disapproval of the world upon which he turned his back. One feels rather that, had God not appeared to Saint-Cyran predominantly as a stern judge, he might have been found a humorous and not unkindly satirist of the human weaknesses it was so much his business to study.

So much for the two figures who stand before the gateway of what might be termed the puritan side of Roman Catholicism in the seventeenth century. It took here two men to fill the place of the single Calvin. Perhaps in part because of this the movement never became so coldly logical as Calvinism. Also, despite the Dutch birth of Jansenius, the movement was French, and so, as the sixteenth century had demonstrated, bound to keep so far as possible within the framework of the historic Church. For the same reason that it was French, the movement could scarcely have lacked a woman among its protagonists. Such it was soon to have in Jacqueline Arnauld who, on becoming a nun, changed her name to Angélique. The portrait of Angélique Arnauld—*la mère Angélique*—by Philippe de Champaigne, is in the Louvre. A stern and masterful angelic mother certainly! Born to dominate, she needed but a rule with which to dominate first her strong and willful self, and then with the absoluteness of that rule to bend others. It is perhaps fortunate that the rule she found was a merciful one at bottom, and that too, with all her relentlessness, Angélique Arnauld had a nature fundamentally warm, and about which there was little or nothing petty. At all events with *la mère Angélique,* the theological movement inaugurated by Jansenius was to become for a time the drama of Port Royal.

---

[10] Letter of Balzac (the seventeenth-century, not the nineteenth-century novelist, Balzac) to Sainte-Cyran. In Sainte-Beuve, *Port Royal,* II, 46-49.

The father of Jacqueline Arnauld was a lawyer of distinguished family and ample means. He had, however, many children. Ambitious for all of these children, his means were not sufficient for him to provide unaided for all of them, in a manner fitting to their station in life. As he "walked in the way of piety without turning aside from those of fortune," he lacked no energy in preparing the way for his children to dignified positions, soliciting at court a situation for his son, and at Rome abbeys for two of his daughters. One of the two so destined for the cloister from birth was the later Mother Angélique. When first told of this destiny, while still a little child, she replied that she was willing to obey the wish of her parents, provided she might be an abbess. Later, when she learned that an abbess was responsible before God for the souls of those put under her charge, she hesitated. Meanwhile she reflected that, had it not been her misfortune to be born the second daughter, her parents would have arranged a marriage for her. Resigning herself to this misfortune she reminded her grandfather of the promise that she should be an abbess, and so indeed she became, at the age of eleven, her age having been put down as seventeen in the papers forwarded to Rome. Monsieur Arnauld *père* was conventional even in conscience, and such falsifications in matters of obtaining ecclesiastical preferment were so common among the best people that it does not appear to have disturbed his piety.

The Abbey of Port Royal, to which he gained her appointment as abbess, was neither of particular wealth nor distinction. Its situation, but a few miles from Versailles, was picturesque, but on account of a stagnant pond which filled the bottom of the valley where its buildings stood, it was unhealthy. As in the majority of the convents of the time, no very strenuous efforts toward unworldliness were attempted. The nuns were, for a large part, young women situated much as Angélique herself, daughters of well-to-do families unable to provide dowries sufficient to arrange satisfactory marriages for them. The nuns amused themselves dressing up and masking at carnival time, they allowed themselves such trifling vanities as wearing gloves, cherishing trinkets, and even more substantial matters of private property. Visitors of both sexes were freely received in the cloistered court and parlors. The nuns were allowed to visit without the convent. The child abbess was bored at times; for a period contemplated giving it all up and returning to the world, which might have been difficult to manage, since her father was a very loving, but also very authoritative master of his family.

There was indeed little to inspire her with desire to stay. As yet she could exercise no administrative authority, and without passionate endeavor or strenuous effort, the routine was dull enough for one whose character possessed a tremendous resource of energy and passion. Their chaplain was so ignorant he could scarcely read beyond his breviary, and sermons were but an occasional treat, when a passing monk or visiting priest edified them with some words in the chapel. One such sermon inspired her to some initial reforms. A poor monk, as it turned out of rather doubtful reputation, knocked at the abbey door one night, and asked that he be allowed to preach to them. It was late, but a sermon promised a break in the routine, and the nuns were assembled in the chapel to hear him. Angélique was now seventeen. This sermon awoke in her desire to reform her life and that of her convent.

The Arnaulds were a family of great solidarity. As Angélique had undertaken her charge while still a child, her parents and relatives had been frequent visitors to Port Royal, embracing the abbey as a sort of family appanage. But, after some preliminary reforms, the abbess decided that the time had come to enforce the rule closing the cloister to strangers. Her first great trial came with the moment when to enforce this rule she was obliged to refuse admittance to her family.

An intended visit had been announced beforehand, the noise of the approaching carriage was heard while the sisters were dining, toward eleven in the morning. It was indeed a family visit: the carriage contained her father, mother, brother, and two sisters. Already, in anticipation of the visit, the keys had been taken from the porter. Those who were in the secret that the family was not to be received had their posts assigned. Mother Angélique was in the chapel on her knees, gathering strength for the coming ordeal. Monsieur Arnauld rapped upon the door. His daughter, now at her post inside the door, replied that, if he would go to the guest's parlor, she would speak to him through the grill. Instead he demanded entrance, adding threats. Madame Arnauld interposed reproaches. The elder brother was more emphatic: Angélique was a monster and a parricide. He appealed to the other nuns against such an affront to such a father, and such a family as theirs. Family pride was a virtue much cherished by the Arnaulds.

Angélique stood firm, and her father then demanded that two younger daughters, in the convent as pensionaries, be handed over. Angélique was already prepared for this demand, and they were let out by another door, through the chapel. Father Arnauld ordered the horses rehitched for departure. Finally he was prevailed upon to enter the parlor for some words with his daughter, who fainted under the strain. At this affection got the upper hand; Angélique had carried her point, and victory came without a breach in the family solidarity. On the contrary, one by one, four sisters, her mother when left a widow, the irate older brother, two brothers younger, two nephews, not to speak of other generations later, were gathered under the influence of Angélique and Port Royal.

Such in brief was the *Day at the Wicket,* a famous landmark in the history of Port Royal. Having passed through this trial Angélique was on the way to become one of the trio with Jansenius and Saint-Cyran. Sainte-Beuve has written that one day, when Jensenius was asked which attribute of God most impressed him, he answered, "The Truth." Saint-Cyran would perhaps have answered, adds Sainte-Beuve, "Power, fearful power of God! The 'Abyss Eternity!' "[11] Mère Angélique, with her no less uncompromising force in the mold of feminine habit, would perhaps have answered, "Obedience." She was no easy taskmaster, either with herself or others. She spent one period attempting to reform a neighboring convent. Retiring virtually defeated, she carried with her on departing a goodly proportion of the nuns of the other convent. Returning with them to Port Royal, she was herself obliged to linger some days in Paris. Fearing the disrupting influence of these new arrivals, she laid upon them a vow of silence for a period of six days, until her own return to Port Royal: no light burden for a bevy of young women, who bore with them the atmosphere of another little world to another bevy of young women.

We need not follow the dramatic history of Port Royal. Its influence was largely among the aristocracy—a very polite and lettered puritanism. Soon after events above recounted, because of the unhealthy character of the abbey's situation, the community was moved to Paris. Already it was renowned. Under its wing came to live a succession of more or less retired fashionable belles: the Princess de Guéménée, of whom a contemporary poet said that "the Day, the Light, and she" was the loveliest of nature's works; Marie de Gonzague, later to be Queen of Poland, who, when asked before her marriage whether she wished to see a portrait of her future husband, replied that she was not interested, since what she was marrying was a crown; Madame de Sablé, cultivated and witty bluestocking, who proved incurably worldly; then, too, the same young princess who, years before, as above mentioned, went to a ball with a hair shirt underneath her ball gown, and enjoyed herself so much that she gave up the idea of becoming a nun. Such was the drawing power of even the sterner sort of religion in those days among the fashionable. And so, too, other members of the Arnauld family became frightened at the very respectable sort of worldly ambition which in this family could hardly be cured by gentle means. A nephew of Angélique deserted a brilliant career at the bar to become a religious hermit. His younger brother, a promising officer, followed his example. In time these two were installed at the old Port Royal in the country. Others joined them; in time the brother who had so harshly rebuked Angélique at the abbey door. The family of Blaise Pascal was drawn into the movement, and his brilliant sister, Jacqueline, became a nun of the community. In the meantime, toward the end of the history of Port Royal, when a school for young people had been founded at Port Royal, the poet Racine had his early education there.

---

[11] *Port Royal,* I, 302-303.

Under a series of circumstances, one of which was the deep love of Angélique for her old abbey, the nuns moved back again to the country. The male solitaries settled there had drained a pond which made it damp, and planted gardens. The place was now salubrious and charming, and the male colony numbered several distinguished gentlemen retired into religion, and as many distinguished scholars and men of letters. At the Sorbonne a younger Arnauld was making his name as a brilliant controversial theologian.

This, however, is but the brighter side of the story of Port Royal. Early in its history Jansenius had died, leaving his *Augustinus* to be published after his death. To those who examined it at Rome it seemed an innocent study of Augustine's thought, and was dedicated to the pope with all respectful humility. But already Saint-Cyran was in trouble for being unwilling to countenance a convenient divorce in the royal circles, and serving a long sentence in prison by order of Richelieu. The death of Richelieu brought his freedom, but it also gave greater freedom to the Jesuits, who had become particularly upset because of the educational program carried on at Port Royal. Then also came the Fronde, which left Louis XIV frightened by anything which looked like rebellion against his divine authority. It has been said of Louis XIV that one may follow changes in his policy by marking changes in his confessors. His coming into the hands of a Jesuit boded no good for Port Royal. Some of its aristocratic patrons had been mixed up in the Fronde also.

The situation between the Jesuits and Port Royal proceeded toward an open quarrel. Antoine, the youngest of the Arnaulds, after some career as a polite cleric with a number of fat benefices, was converted. He prepared, against Jesuit conceptions generally, a treatise narrowing the door against those who had learned to find an easy solvent for troubled souls in the eucharist. His was another, and a more effective step than that of Jansenius, in the same direction, since it was a less ponderous treatise. Jesuits attacked him bitterly, and he was obliged to go into hiding for a time. Pascal then lent a hand, publishing anonymously his *Provinciales,* a comprehensive satiric attack on Jesuit casuistry. Thus was instituted a period of persecution, which outlived Mother Angélique, and did not terminate until Port Royal itself was no more. The hatred of Louis XIV for this community became almost an obsession, fed by the Jesuits, and hardly discouraged by Madame de Maintenon, the rather priggish person who began her eventful career as governess of the children of one of the king's former mistresses, and whom he was to marry privately before the end of his reign. Madame de Maintenon considered docility the first of all virtues, and fitting to persons of all ages,[12] particularly admiring the Duchess of Burgundy who, though the first princess in the land, over whom she had no authority whatsoever, was still amiably accustomed to receive from Madame de Maintenon, with impeccable manners, and even thanks, the good advice she gave her.[13]

---

[12] The little *talks* which Madame de Maintenon from time to time gave her protégés at Saint-Cyr furnish insight into her religious temperament. "Rien n'est d'un meilleur augure pour l'avenir que cette docilité à se laisser conduire. . . . Et ne croyez pas que ce soit une vertu d'enfant; cette docilité convient à tout age, et je suis persuadée que Notre-Seigneur la recommandait à ses Apôtres lorsqu'il leur disait: Si vous ne devenez pas comme des enfants, vous n'entrirez pas dans le royaume de Dieu."

Political consideration retarded the dissolution of Port Royal. The Cardinal de Retz, Archbishop of Paris, had been banished for complicity in the Fronde, but declined to resign his office. While the king might, according to the arrangement long since made between a pope and Francis I, name his successor, he could not depose him. The Cardinal, not less than other prominent Frondeurs, was on the whole friendly to Port Royal, and there were other friends in prominent places. But De Retz became tired of his wandering life of exile, and arranged a retirement, upon condition of being allowed to return to France. Long before there had been obtained from Rome a condemnation of five propositions, as to the nature of grace, alleged to be taken from Jansen's *Augustinus.* Louis XIV now resolved that the successor of De Retz should force from Port Royal a subscription to this condemnation.

The Jansenists had, from the first, refused to accept the propositions condemned, as a proper interpretation of the *Augustinus;* and while willing to accept the condemnation of the propositions themselves, drew a line between the question of theory embraced in the five propositions, and the question of fact, as to whether they expressed the intention of Jansenius. So they had agreed upon a very humble and conciliating compromise, but Louis wanted no conciliation, and was to be contented with nothing less than the destruction of the whole community. On the retirement of De Retz it was well understood that no one would be appointed in his place who had not promised beforehand to obtain the signature of the Port Royalists or their destruction. The first appointee died before he could take office. His successor, quickly named, was reminded of what he had promised. He lost no time in making his official visitation to the convent, could find nothing to complain of, but as he parted, having discovered that upon the question of signing the renunciation of Jansenius' views in the form required they were obdurate, he exclaimed to one of the nuns: "You are wiser than the Pope, the Church, and your Archbishop! In the name of God, my Sister, collect yourself, this is an unbearable pride. . . . Here in this house I find neither humility nor obedience." None the less the nuns had agreed upon a willingness to sign, if permitted to add this qualitative subscription:

---

[13] She also informed her young wards: "Il n'y a rien si aimable qu'un esprit accommodant." Here they soon proved lacking at Port Royal.

> We, the undersigned, promise a sincere submission and subscription to the faith. And, since as to the fact (the interpretation of Jansenius involved) we cannot have any understanding ourselves, we attempt to form no judgment; but we rest in the respect and silence fitting our condition and state.

Nothing less than complete and unqualified submission was satisfactory to Louis XIV, and before long carriages were at the door to carry off the pensionaries, the convent was put under another order, and the history of Port Royal was finished. But still not finished. The movement, even in the midst of persecution, had awakened much sympathetic interest. Several prominent bishops were included among the sympathizers. Nor was this all: the very day that the officers of the archbishop arrived to carry into effect the dissolution of the community, no less a person than Molière was a guest of one of the noble ladies who lived under the wing of Port Royal, and even at the moment that the distressed women were being torn from their convent, he was reading aloud, in the salon of Madame de Longueville, his *Tartuffe.* The reading was interrupted by one who came to tell the painful news that Port Royal was to be no more.

Molière represented in but one way the reaction of which Port Royal was a part; represented it on the side of critical satire of which superficialities and pretenses of an age which, with all its graciousness, easily emphasized gestures in the grand style, at the expense of what they were supposed to express. But the Port Royal influence, before it began to disintegrate, passed, in so far as it was an emphasis upon the great gulf existing between erring humanity and the God to whom this humanity looked for its salvation, permanently into literature and thought, by way of Pascal, one of the masters of seventeenth-century thought, and of French literature.

Pascal did not come to Port Royal by way of the initial influence of Jansenius and Saint-Cyran. These two had become interested, while both young students, single-mindedly in the problem of sin and salvation; Pascal spent the largest part of his life in what might be described as a passionate quest for demonstrable certainty, which quest fascinated him from early youth, first in the form of geometrical reasoning. His sister wrote of him that, while still a child, he was unable to surrender himself, save to what seemed to him evidently true, and was continually wishing to know, "the reason of all things."[14]

But there was another story in connection with his infancy, and another side to his influence and environment, which seems to go ill with his studies with a father himself devoted to mathematics and science. He suffered for months, practically his entire second year, from a strange malady, of two peculiar symptoms: he could not bear the sight of water, nor to see his father and his mother together. This malady was laid to the charge of witchcraft, practiced against him by a poor woman to whom his father had given shelter, and it was believed to have been cured in the veritable manner of undoing malevolent enchantments.[15] Also, while still but a precocious youth, Pascal could not abide speculations which disturbed matters of established theological doctrine.[16]

We have here the two poles between which in a measure Pascal's life may be said to have oscillated: a passionate desire for clearly demonstrated intellectual certainty; a supersensitive nature, in a body fragile and seldom in good health, subject to strong fixations, afflicted perhaps in infancy with some traumatic experience the precise nature of which we can hardly guess save at random, and surrounded by an influence which, while encouraging scientific curiosity, also harbored not only conventional and superstitious piety, but even superstition which had little to do with piety at all.

---

[14] From a *Life of Pascal* written after his death, by Madame Perier, his sister.

[15] This story entire is found in a *Mémoire* of his life written by Mademoiselle Perier, his niece.

[16] *Life,* by Mme. Perier.

Superimposed upon this there is an intellectual influence, as he developed into manhood, which divides into three rather distinct streams. The first is mathematical science, in which he early demonstrated one of the most astonishing gifts of genius the progress of science has ever known. The second is Stoicism, and more particularly the Stoicism of Epictetus. The third is Montaigne.

From science, in which he reasoned mathematically, he came to realize that the universe of mathematical conceptions possesses incommensurable orders. By adding quantity to quantity one could never pass from one of these orders to another. No conceivable addition of point to point could make a line, no superposition of line on line could form a plane, no superposition of plane on plane a solid. Such truths generalized spoke of the rationally untraversible gap between the *finite* and the *infinite.* We have already quoted Pascal once, upon the subject of the infinitely small. We cannot here set down the numerous jottings in his *Pensées* which show how deeply the conception of the infinite affected him. *"Combien de royaumes nous ignorent!"* How many orders are there of which we know nothing! "The eternal silence of infinite spaces frightens me."[17] Considered with respect to the Jansenist movement, this current of his speculation ran into the Jansenist quarrel with scholastic theologians, aiming to explain and comprehend and lay down definite interpretations of doctrine, claimed by Jansenists to be vain and sophistical.

The reaction of Pascal against the Stoics again, though arising independently, ran into the current of Jansenist criticism. If the Scholastics were guilty of intellectual pride, the Stoics were guilty of moral pride. After discoursing upon the moral dignity of utterances of Epictetus, Pascal adds, "I dare say he would have deserved adoration, had he equally understood his own powerlessness. . . . He says that God has given to every man the means of satisfying all his obligations; and that these means are always within his powers."[18]

---

[17] *Pensées,* chap. xxv, xviii (a fragment among the *Pensées* published subsequent to 1843).

Montaigne's influence was, in the realm of human character and conduct, as unsettling as the mind-transcending infinite for speculation. Montaigne, Pascal concludes, "considering humanity as destitute of any revelation . . . sets everything in doubt," so universal and general that the doubt recoils upon himself, "in a perpetual circle, without rest."[19]

In short, the eternal was an order of infinity, all attempts to approach which by reason were vain and presumptuous. One must fall back upon a revealed faith.

And what was the test of revealed faith? It could not be the perceived *order* of the universe, since adding fact to fact by investigation was to approach no nearer to infinity.

> Therefore, since everything is effect and cause, aided and aiding, mediate and immediate, everything standing and holding together, by a natural and insensible bond that unites even the most distant and different things, I hold it impossible to know the parts without knowing the whole, or any more to know the whole without knowing all the parts individually.[20]

The test of revealed faith was then in miracle. A miracle had indeed been an important element in Pascal's own conversion. Some kindly disposed friend of Port Royal had presented to the abbey a thorn from the crown of Jesus. It had cured one of his nieces of a fistula upon her face, and Pascal at times believed, apparently, that this miracle had been performed, one almost might say more for him than for her.

Pascal defines a miracle as "an effect which exceeds the natural power of the instrument it employs." The Devil may perform cures, which are not miracles, since it is within the Devil's power to cure.[21] As a matter of fact Pascal's doctrine with regard to miracles does not appear altogether clear. Miracle and doctrine are linked together closely, and in a sense reciprocally. "Miracles discern doctrine, and doctrine discerns miracles."[22] And yet one does not "judge miracle by doctrine, but doctrine by miracle," save apparently in certain cases where, if apparent miracles exhibit themselves among schismatics, their authenticity is to be rejected, because in this case "the condition of schism, more clearly visible than the miracle, visibly marks the error."[23]

---

[18] *Entretien de Pascal avec M. de Saci, etc.* (*Opuscules*).

[19] *Ibid.*

[20] *Pensées,* chap. ii, 1.

[21] *Ibid.,* chap. xxxiii.

We cannot, however, attempt to follow Pascal's fragmentary apologetic, left in unordered sheets, and never actually begun. Two things only we need to say of it in concluding. It was one with the initial intention of the whole Jansenist movement, in that it threw humanity back upon the need of redemption, which humanity was unable of itself to achieve. Nothing in life indeed served men in the task of preparing for death, other than an attempt at self-purification, in contemplation of the tremendous gap which separated sinful men from the required ideal of holiness that had been revealed. When, however, we turn to the practical side, we find Pascal himself in some ways more superstitious than the best of Jansenism. He appears to have spent much time his last years in going from one church to another where relics were displayed, and he kept "a spiritual almanac, which informed him as to times and places of special devotions."[24]

Great as was Pascal the thinker and literary genius, his conversion hardly ranks as one of the great and vigorous ones of Christian experience. It was in a measure the conversion of a man sick of mind and body, behind and through which, however, there are repeated conceptions of the loftiest grandeur. His thought entire is marked by a sense of the deep *contraries,* limiting poles of incompatible nature later to become more clearly developed by metaphysical speculation. But, of these incompatibilities, in the end Pascal concentrates upon those of the full nature of man himself: "The grandeur of Man consists in the fact that he knows himself miserable"; "Man is neither an angel nor a beast . . . who would act the angel, plays the beast"; but, a religion, *strange* religion as he says, "requiring man to recognize himself as vile and even abominable, while commanding him to wish to be like unto God," made of him the *glory* of the universe.

---

[22] *Ibid.,* xxxiii, 1.

[23] *Pensées,* xxxiii, ix.

[24] *Life* of Mme. Perier.

No European thinker ever perhaps so concentrated upon the troubled nature of Man, or so clearly based an apologetic for Christianity just there and nowhere else. It was not all of Jansenism or of Port Royal, this conversion, nor was all its intellectual fruit. Perhaps, however, no other person so deeply and completely analyzed the sources, both of unrest and of comfort, which gave this movement its initial energy, and which made it persistent. And yet the thought of Pascal misses skepticism very narrowly in the intellectual field, and even evidences a desire to flee from it. It misses, too, the moral confusion of Montaigne very narrowly. As for the question of God and immortality, it may sometimes seem to leave it largely, as Pascal himself in one place considers it, a gamble on a chance, in which one might, or might not, be disposed to agree with him that, in betting *for* rather than *against,* one lost nothing important if one lost, and might hope to win infinitely.[25]

At all events the eighteenth century was to go, for the most part, another way than that of Pascal, with enthusiasms most of which he did not touch, and few of which he dampened. Indeed, not the last among those to follow this new way were the very Puritans, of one sort or another, with whom the Jansenist movement links.

[25] *Pensées,* chap. xi, 1.

# BOOK X

# SOLUTIONS AND DISSOLUTIONS OF RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY

# LIX

In 1688, with the crowning of William and Mary as monarchs of Great Britain, for the first time in Europe the theory of the divine right of kings received a clearly designed and directed blow, quite other than the delegated act of divine punishment which had made of Charles I a martyr in that cause. On the one hand William himself hated no one thing in Europe so much as the reign of Louis XIV in France, which represented more completely than anywhere that theory. On the other hand God-fearing and God-elected leaders of the solid middle class had a king who was exactly where they wanted him, tied by a contract which told the monarch where his power rested, and to what boundaries it extended.

Here England was decidedly in the van. During the seventeenth century political philosophy had developed a theory of absolutism which had nothing to do with divine rulers whatsoever. The English philosopher Hobbes believed that absolute rulers were and had been set up by the common consent of the governed, over one another separately, lest they each and all cut one another's throats. But, early in the eighteenth century, political theory, in Calvinist countries, had caught up with the practical situation in England.

> The sovereign magistrate, whatever name he be given, is not at all sent from heaven, but is established by the common consent of the citizens. He, if he wishes to conduct himself in a manner worthy of a prince or magistrate, must recognize himself as being subject to the laws, and not think himself above all law. He should measure his power, not by his caprice, but according to the requirements of the public good. Acting otherwise he acts, not as a prince or magistrate, but as a tyrant, and may then be suppressed by his subjects, in virtue of all law, whether human or divine.[1]

---

[1] *Des Droits de la Puissance Souveraine, etc.* Translated by a Swiss (Jean Barbevac) from the Latin of a law professor of the University of Leyden (Noodt), Amsterdam, 1714.

The situation in Catholic countries was to be far more complicated. The power of the Bourbon family was to increase during the first half of the eighteenth century, until there were five European monarchs of this stock. The divine effulgence radiating from the *Roi Soleil* had diffused in other forms, and there were literally hundreds of lesser princelings, folded about with vestments a little shabby sometimes, which had been lowered upon them from the skies, most of whom attempted to maintain, often rather pathetically, court manners and customs, and an atmosphere of adulation imitated from that which surrounded Louis XIV and his great grandson at Versailles. These sovereigns might some of them envy the wealth of the papal see, and all of them resent any ability of its prestige to cross national boundary lines, and influence the opinions, even the actions, of their subjects. The principles and maxims of French Gallicanism penetrated other Catholic nations. Even the political policies of the Holy Roman Empire, which had more to gain from traditions of papal supremacy than any other European power, became more and more independent of the papacy. When, in 1769, Joseph II, emperor and son of Maria Theresa, visited Rome, he was the first of these emperors to have done so in over two hundred years; and before leaving he took occasion to say to the cardinals that they should keep their desires moderate, since the power of the pope in the spiritual realm was incontestable, and he should be content with that, and, above all, "in dealing with political sovereigns, he should never so far forget himself as to violate the rules of politics and of good breeding."

In France the Jansenist controversy trailed far into the eighteenth century, and for a time threatened the calling of a national council, which would doubtless at that time have caused a breach with Rome, not to mention many troublesome subsidiary questions which an anonymous doctor of the Sorbonne believed dangerous to precipitate in such times.[2] The century began with some popes of no particular personal force, and then, just before the middle of the century came a conciliating pope (Benedict XIV), who won much approval from sovereigns by the modesty of his claims, and who also, before the steady growth of infidelity among the prominent personages of his flock, believed it hardly safe to require more of them than that they "believed in God."

---

[2] *Mémoires et Réflexions sur la Constitution Unigenitus,* and *Mémoire de M. N., Avocat au Parlement de Paris, etc.,* Amsterdam, 1717.

King's ministers were gaining influence, and the changing character of the problems of monarchs, together with a desire to shake free of papal power, caused them to be chosen less and less among ecclesiastics, and often among lawyers and men of affairs drawn from the upper middle class. Lawyers had their own particular reason for disliking ecclesiastical influence, since the Church divided legal jurisdiction, and left many cases to the ecclesiastical canonists.[8]

The rising tide of Enlightenment was to gather in three important monarchs; in Russia, in the Empire, and in Prussia. Jansenist enthusiasm was to split, on the one hand leaning toward the side of the philosophers, because of sympathy they found there in their quarrel with the papacy and the Jesuits; on the other furnishing for a considerable time a fantastic contrast to the rising tide of reason.

In 1721 the Deacon Paris, a hermit of Jansenist persuasion, died. He had practiced his austerities in the center of Paris, living in a penthouse, where he slept upon an old wardrobe turned upon its back and elongated with a few planks to the length of his body. Buried in the city churchyard, his tomb soon became a place of pilgrimage. Then miracles of healing began to take place among those who betook themselves thither and crawled under the sarcophagus which held his body. This was not the entire influence of the saint. He took to causing strange convulsive movements in persons not apparently affected by any disease. Excitement became so great that the king ordered the cemetery closed to the public; it being stated in defense of this action, by physicians and surgeons commissioned to examine the situation, that there was nothing "convulsive or supernatural" about these strange movements, but that they were "entirely voluntary, from which it was plainly evident that they were an attempt to create an illusion, and exploit the credulity of the common people."[4]

---

[8] *Cambridge Modern History,* VI, 587.

The closing of the cemetery served to exercise the wit of various wags, who posted rhymes upon its gates:

De par le roi défense à Dieu
De faire miracle en ce lieu.

Un décrotteur à la royale,
Du talon gauche estropié,
Obtint par grace speciale
D'être boiteux de l'austre pied.[5]

Returning, however, to the matter of politics, in which the influence of religion was becoming complicated, by a tendency of divine monarchs to snub or quarrel with the papacy, and by the cold douche of reason, about to wash off some gilt from the tinsel of the Divine Right of Kings; it was the Calvinists who had perfected far the simplest, clear and cold, black and white conception of religion in government. It was the elect whom God had appointed to rule and order society. It was they who were to set up, or down, kings and other divinely appointed potentates, as God's *Kurfürsten.* So the army of Independents in England had brought Charles I to the bar of God's judgment, attainted him of crimes and profligacies, deposed and beheaded him—an army which, perhaps more than any army since the First Crusade, felt itself to be God's instrument.

But all through the Protectorate, when Cromwell appears to have made the most sincere and complete attempt at religious tolerance ever up to then undertaken in Europe, and through the following rather brief opportunity given the Stuarts to retrieve their damaged reputation among the elect, it became apparent, even to the elect, that there might be something to be said for this Law of Reason and Nature. During the seventeenth century, almost every sort of religiously inspired rule had tried to shoulder its way into England; the bishops having the last word (and it would appear the most tyrannic).[6] The dissolute period of the Regency in France crossed to England, making it clear how many of the reprobate there were, and how many reprobate tendencies even among the elect. The natural law was a milder tempered affair than the divine. With it one might order with less friction large portions of the reprobate; and with it, too, the elect might stray a little farther into the territory of the reprobate. One might, relenting a little outwardly, hide the secret of his election a little deeper in his heart, not openly insisting upon it, and rule as a Whig.

---

[4] From the decree closing the cemetery. Mathieu, *Histoire des miracles et des convulsionaires de St.-Médard,* 218.

[5] "In the name of the King, God is forbidden to perform miracles in this place. . . . A boot-black *à la royale,* lame in the left heel, by special grace is permitted to limp with the other foot."

So, with Britain in the vanguard, the century-old doctrine of the divinity of government was knit, almost imperceptibly, to prudent reasonableness. Most of the trappings of divine royalty were kept, just as the sixteenth century had kept most of the trappings of medieval religion. An opulent merchant, who despises artists in his heart, may still covet the possession of their works, particularly if they are very expensive. So too, the picturesque splendor of monarchy is not to be despised, if one can but put and keep it in its place, and has a purse able to afford such luxuries.

But it was not only in the sphere of law and government that, during the seventeenth century, reason written with a capital began to demand a larger territory. Here again England was in the van, and here was no quixotic quest. One left behind all the soaring untamed fancifulness of the Middle Ages, all the extravagant enthusiasms of the Renaissance, when, with John Locke, one sat down to investigate how this thing called reason worked, and what it was good for. Descartes, despite his skeptic squint and dominant interest in mathematical science, had not kept reason away from metaphysics. Spinoza and Leibnitz were little content with less than a substantial understanding of the universe entire. England herself, in the seventeenth century, had an attack of this same malady, as harmless generally as the measles, and soon forgotten in the very learned and comprehensive *Intellectual System of the Universe* of Cudworth. Descartes had more or less frightened people everywhere in Europe where his influence went, but Locke, despite some doubts and misgivings later for which he may have been in a measure responsible, was consoling at the outset.

---

[6] As an interesting commentary upon the pliability of the Elect, the Commons, predominantly Presbyterian in the reign of Charles I, appear to have been staunch upholders of the bishops and conformity at the Restoration.

> Men have reason to be well satisfied with what God has thought fit for them, since he has given them . . . whatever is necessary for the convenience of life and information of virtue; and has put within the reach of their discovery the comfortable provision for this life, and the way that leads to a better. . . . Men will find matter sufficient to busy their heads, and employ their hands with variety, delight, and satisfaction, if they will not boldly quarrel with their constitution, and throw away the blessings their hands are filled with, because they are not big enough to grasp everything.[7]

For some time, in England, some eminently intelligent persons continued in the proper and modest *conduct of the Understanding.*[8] The "Royal Society of London, for Improving Natural Knowledge" was founded (1662).[9] Harvey discovered how the blood circulates, Boyle experimented with gases, Newton linked together all bodies of earth and sky with a Law of Gravitation. Such knowledge of nature seemed only to fortify faith in God, whose orderly intentions were evident in the harmonious workings of the universal machine.

> The Heavens declare the glory of God,
> And the firmament showeth his handiwork.

An old theme was revived, in a new context and with new reënforcement: a theme to which doubtless none of these scientists would have dissented.

There was not, however, the medieval desire to link this theme with one settled doctrinal system. By the beginning of the eighteenth century it was no longer a mere matter of choosing the Catholic or some Protestant tradition, believed to be of universal authority. One might find reasoned arguments for toleration which left the scientist much latitude in choosing his articles of religious faith. It might be argued that religious tolerance came under that *natural right* according to which "it is permitted to each and every person to conduct himself according to his own understanding, in his private affairs which were the business of no one at all besides himself." [10]

---

[7] John Locke, *An Essay concerning Human Understanding,* chap. i.

[8] Italicized words are title of an earlier and less well-known work of Locke.

[9] In France an *Académie des Sciences* was founded in 1666, and refounded under royal patronage in 1699.

> All men on coming into the world are inevitably drawn to seek their own advantage, and to avoid what is hurtful to them. This dominating inclination is not even peculiar to the human species, but one remarks it in animals generally.[11]

It almost looked, from one angle, as though religion was on the eve of becoming a no longer troubling social or political factor. Everyone, according to Professor Noodt, should be allowed to choose religion, according as it seemed reasonable to him personally, and to fight for it against all interference, just like any other animal. So, if all men would but lose all interest, practical or theoretical, in anybody's religion save his own, and would keep his own religion out of the way of anyone besides himself, one might hope to see the religious situation perfectly peaceful.

Such might have seemed to be the ideal result of the entrance of reason into the sphere of religion. Unfortunately things were not going to work out that way. Reason had itself a way of claiming more than personal and individual authority; those who found no reason at all in religion had a way of resenting the fact that any other persons should find it there, making irreverent gestures to ridicule the religious, calling them insulting names; and then, too, there were many practical interests involved: religion was socially *in,* with many solid prerogatives and advantages for which it was willing to fight, on the basis of the human and animal natural right to seek its advantage, and avoid things hurtful; and in some respects the reasonable were not in, but decidedly *out.*

---

[10] *De la Liberté de Conscience,* again from the Dutch professor Noodt, as translated by the Swiss, Barbeyrac, 311 (1714).

[11] *Ibid.,* 312.

So the question of religion was by no means to slip peaceably toward toleration during the eighteenth century. It had been, however, rather the theologians than the philosophers and scientists, who had begun to mix up reason and doctrine in controversial ways, claiming authority for their doctrines on reasonable interpretations of Scripture. All could not agree, it became plain in the seventeenth century, as to the interpretation of all things in Scripture. In the interests of toleration they attempted, more modestly, to agree upon what might be called "all saving things," only to discover that "those fundamental saving things were very few." And soon, just as, behind all forms of government there had been found a *natural basis* for society, and behind all enacted laws a *natural law,* soon there was a *natural theology,* with a "true function in regard to sacred and evangelical theology." In the eighteenth-century atmosphere a natural theology was almost certain to claim prerogatives which subordinated all others. Slipping to the side of reason began to be very easy, despite statements that "the contents of revelation transcend reason, but in no respect contradict it." This sounds like Thomas Aquinas, but was on the slide toward bringing religion to the bar of reason for trial: "Do I dishonor my faith, or do any wrong to it to tell the world that my reason and my understanding are satisfied in it? I have no reason against it; yea, the highest and purest reason for it."[12]

It is enough for us here to leave the seventeenth century, noting only that from it, into the century following, there was carried the idea that there were two parts of religion, two elements of religion, or even perhaps two kinds of religion, one of which might be called *natural religion,* the other *revealed religion;* and that men wanted to know, more and more, that revealed religion was not in too direct and flagrant conflict with the orderliness which men were beginning more and more to seek in the great natural *machine.*

---

[12] This and quotations immediately preceding are taken from a controversy of two English divines. Tulloch, *Rational Theology in England in the Seventeenth Century,* II, 45ff.

What this natural religion was, let us leave for a moment to consider another correlated splitting of equal importance.

In the old pre-Christian ages, when philosophers in Greece began to undermine the authority of the Olympian Gods, they did it as effectively as any other way, by turning the ethical criteria of budding speculation in judgment against the conduct of these Olympians, as displayed in tales the still older poets had recounted of them. Something similar began to happen. Calvin's school had been very emphatic on the subject of morals, going straight back to Moses for a revealed moral code. But, as the eighteenth century advanced, there came to be a thing which might be called *natural morals,* as well as the older thing instituted by Moses, and retained as *revealed morals.*

Following Calvin, revealed morals were contained in a code, established by a God very zealous to be obeyed; who indeed disliked nothing so much as being disobeyed. It was hardly in order to ask, either why God was so very angry at disobedience, or why he had chosen to command the precise things he had. But, during the seventeenth century, ethics had begun, as we have already noted, to link up with metaphysics. This linkage ranged from the speculative-imaginative, such as in Spinoza and Leibnitz, to emotional-religious, as noted in Jeremy Taylor. But some later thinkers[13] attempted to bring the linkage within clearer boundaries, deciding that morals were morals because they followed the pattern which determined God in his action. Moses appeared to agree with this, for he was believed to have written that, after working hard for six days at the task of creation, God rested the seventh day, wherefore human beings should rest every seven days. It seemed reasonable to go on assuming that God neither murdered, stole, committed adultery, bore false witness, nor coveted a single possession of another.

In so deciding, as a very delicately minded critical mind of the eighteenth century pointed out, "Instead of transferring from God to man, they transfer from man to God; and whilst they boast that man is made after the image of God, they make God after the image of man."[14] What a very similar conclusion Greek philosophers had come to as regarding the birth origin of the Olympians!

---

[13] So, for example, Cudworth.

But the critic of those who would bind God by the moral injunctions laid upon human beings does not stop with criticism. He lays it down that the morality of human actions, since human beings are of a social nature, derives from their social natures, and indeed their basis lies deeper than society, in the very system of nature in which man has been placed.[15]

So here is a basis for natural morals, which is so comprehensive that revealed morality appears to have little important independent ground to stand on.

> The man who neglects the duties of natural religion, and the obligations of morality, acts against his nature, and lives in open defiance to the author of it. God declares for one order of things, he for another. . . . He who acts in a conformity to the nature of things, carries on the system of God, and coöperates with him.[16]

Here Bolingbroke introduces the term *natural religion,* reminding us that we have postponed defining it. Let us postpone the task yet once again, quoting the same author as to what it is *not.*

> I conclude . . . by asking . . . whether the doctrine of imitating God, even so far as we are able, does not tend to draw men off unnecessarily, and, if I may say so, wantonly, from real knowledge, into those abstractions that have led so many to confound the divine and the human nature, to imagine an uninterrupted scale of intelligence from man up to God, to flatter themselves with notions, not only of imitating him, but of being united with him, and to invent or adopt . . . all that metaphysical and mystical blasphemy which has passed for the most sublime theology?[17]

We may now at last attempt to define the natural religion which, as deism, opened the eighteenth-century attack upon the traditional religious institutions from an angle quite different from that of the sixteenth century. The sixteenth century had begun with obvious abuses, had proceeded to study early Christian documents, and had attempted to decide what was legitimate and what spurious Christianity. Deism proceeded differently. First, it accepted a theistic hypothesis, as believed upheld by the perceived order of the universe. Second, it accepted the idea of moral obligations, in general as developed through human experience and registered in the institutions of law and social order, as prescribing conduct in harmony with the laws which governed that universe, and were necessary to preserve peace and good fellowship among men. Its main preoccupation, however, was neither with abuses, documents, nor Christian history. Religion was here clearly, as indicated by the direction in which seventeenth-century speculation had been slipping, brought before the bar of something called reason, in order to be judged.

---

[14] Bolingbroke, *Works* (ed. 1754), V, 43.

[15] *Works,* V, 47.

[16] *Ibid.,* V, 65.

[17] *Ibid.,* V, 67.

One of the first results of this inquisition was to draw a line between religion and theology. Montesquieu, who was to become more conservative in his older years, oscillating between deism and a rather conservative Christian sentiment, more sympathetic to Protestantism, points out this cleavage in his early satire (1711):

> That magician is called the Pope: sometimes he makes one believe that three are one only; that the bread one eats is not bread only, or that the wine one drinks is not wine; and a thousand other things of that sort.[18]

Voltaire became the great popular spokesman of this destructive struggle. "A false science makes atheists, a true science prostrates man before the divinity; makes just and wise those whom theology has rendered iniquitous and mad." [19]

> It is absolutely essential that theology be destroyed, as we have destroyed judicial astrology, magic, the divining needle, the *Cabal,* and the *Star Chamber. . . .* Theology has never served for anything save to turn upside-down people's brains, and indeed sometimes nations. [And in another of his changeful moods] Theology amuses me; there, in all its plenitude, is the madness [or folly] of the human spirit.[20]

For all this folly and madness natural religion had a substitute to suggest. We may take it as well as anywhere from Bolingbroke:

---

[18] Montesquieu, *Lettres Persanes,* Lettre XXIV.

[19] Quoted from Nourisson, *Voltaire et le Voltairisme,* 463.

[20] *Ibid.,* 462.

> This religion shows us a Supreme Being, veiled in the majesty of his nature, but manifested in all his works, to be the true and only true object of our adoration. In the existence he has given us, and in the benefits that attach us so strongly to it, this religion shows him to be the first and greatest object of our gratitude; in the established order of things, subject to so many vicissitudes and yet so constant, to be the reasonable, as well as necessary object of our resignation; and finally in the wants, distresses and dangers, which these vicissitudes bring frequently upon us, to be the comfortable object of our hope: in which hope, the religion of nature will teach us, no doubt, to address ourselves to the Almighty, in a manner consistent with an entire resignation to his will, as some of the heathen did. But this religion will not teach us to pray, as if we informed omniscience, or expostulated with omnipotence, as those who pretend to be the most reformed Christians are accustomed to do; nor to make religion a service of show and outward gesture, as your pretended Catholic church has done. The religion of nature teaches to worship God in spirit and in truth, that is inwardly and sincerely. It neither confounds spiritual pride and enthusiasm, nor theatrical pomps and superstitious rites, with devotion. Fraud, envy, malice, silent and secret vices, more dangerous often to society than those of greater éclat, have lurked behind the former. The latter, though they affect the senses without touching the heart, have passed in general, and still pass, for divine worship. God has been served, in a manner which the most sanguinary tyrant would abhor, by some people. By others, with all the circumstance of that low adulation which earthly monarchs require, and whereof the priests have claimed a share. That there is a middle proceeding fair to be observed, between a theatrical worship and a worship stripped of all outward solemnity and pomp, I am ready to admit. In this . . . the law of nature and right reason may approve such laws and institutions as nature or reason has not prescribed. . . . But then they ought to pass for forms directed to this purpose, for human not divine ordinances. Let the priest wear a ridiculous cap and breastplate, or fringes and bells on his robe, but let it not be said that the Supreme Being took care of his attire, or that such institutions as these were the institutions of divine wisdom.[21]

Such reasoned, calm, and statesmanlike discussions of the subject were, however, hardly to be the rule as time went on. And still the deepest cutting criticism for long found it wiser to mask itself. The most comprehensive attempt to undermine the traditional religion was doubtless that which in a sense masqueraded as a compendium of all human knowledge; the *Encyclopedia* of which the astonishingly clever and fertile Denis Diderot was the most prominent single figure. It put, side by side, in various articles, "old prejudices" and "new philosophy"; old quarrels over words and somber gloomy asceticisms, and a new smiling humane civilization.[22]

---

[21] Bolingbroke, *Works,* V, 97-98.

But there came to be much which might be bandied openly in jest, and since we can choose but a few examples, let us take at random, first of all, one from the inimitable pen of Laurence Sterne—a bit of ridicule directed against the absurd disputes of polemically disposed theologians.

> Pray, Mr. Yorick, quoth my uncle Toby,—do tell me what a polemic divine is?—The best description, Captain Shandy, I have ever read, is a couple of 'em, replied Yorick, in the account of the battle fought single hands betwixt Gymnast and captain Tripet; which I have in my pocket. . . . Yorick took a book from his right-hand coat-pocket, and read, or pretended to read, as follows:
>
> —"which words being heard by all the soldiers which were there, divers of them being inwardly terrified, did shrink back and make way for the assailant: all this did Gymnast very well remark and consider; and therefore making as if he would have alighted from his horse . . . he most nimbly . . . launched himself in the air, and placed both his feet upon his saddle, standing upright, with his back towards his horse's head,—Now (said he) my case goes forward. Then suddenly . . . he fetched a gambol upon one foot, and turning to the left-hand, failed not to carry his body perfectly round, just into his former position. . . . Well, said Gymnast, I have failed,—I will undo this leap; then with a marvelous strength and agility . . . he fetched another gambol as before . . . set his right hand upon the bow of his saddle . . . poising and upholding his whole weight upon the muscle and nerve of the said thumb, and so turned and whirled himself about three times. . . .
>
> (This can't be fighting, said my uncle Toby.—The corporal shook his head at it.—Have patience, said Yorick.)[23]

By no means all of the criticism of theology was so veiled and subtle as this. Drawing up a plan of a university for the Russian government, Diderot wrote, under the heading, "Of Our Faculty of Theology":

---

[22] For summary of this hidden purpose, Giraud, *Le Christianisme de Chateaubriand,* I, 57-64.

[23] Sterne, *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy,* book v, parts of chaps. xxviii, xxix.

> The faculty of theology . . . is itself an excellent school for infidels. . . . They are the most useless, unmanageable, and dangerous subjects of the state. With their adherents, priests and monks, they have often abused their right to harangue gatherings of people. If I were a ruler, and reflected how, every Sunday and festival, between eleven o'clock and midday, one hundred and fifty thousands of my subjects repeated to others, and made them believe, in the name of God, all the things appropriate to the demon of fanaticism and pride who possessed them, I should tremble with terror.[24]

This advice, however, was given to a prince who was expected to found his government upon reason. On the whole, when looking for an explanation as to how and why the practices and beliefs of traditional religion had arisen, a very old, too simple, and too plausible reason was more likely to be advanced, which made these *fanaticisms* the servant, rather than the enemy, of the state. Religion was said to be, for the most part, a pious fraud, built around the desire of priests to make themselves important, and to enable them to exact money and support from society; and these priests, with their teachings and practices, had been upheld by princes, who found God a very useful "bogey to frighten grown-up children to bed with, if nothing else avails." [25]

And even the social philosophers of the eighteenth century who felt themselves emancipated, were by no means unwilling to see society avail itself of this potent buttress of public order and morals. Mirabeau proclaimed religion "the first among social benefits," and believed in the necessity of "deifying duty." [26] Montesquieu, whom we have quoted in ridicule of the pope, of doctrine, and of sacrament, refused to go with the Encyclopedists as an enemy of religion; nevertheless, he held the truth of the Christian Religion, and every other, to be a function of its social utility.

---

[24] Diderot, *Plan d'une Université pour le Gouvernement de Russie, Œuvres Complètes,* ed. Assezat, III, 438.

[25] The quotation is from Schopenhauer, *Religion, A Dialogue.* Similar sentiments are however easily collectable during the eighteenth century.

[26] Giraud, *Le Christianisme de Chateaubriand,* I, 45.

So much for reason, discrediting or utilizing religion.

But who wants, at all times and everywhere, to be reasonable? In a counting house, perhaps; or figuring the value of church bells melted and coined into money.[27] But, in a boudoir, beneath the shade of a forest, beside a stream, upon the summit of a mountain, in the midst of a revolution, or in church—that is quite another question, even for the sophisticated. The music of the spheres, tuned to the cadence of the Law of Gravitation, might be reasoned and orderly, but there always has been—has there not?—another and different sort of music. And even in an age of reason one may be tempted to turn aside and listen to this other sort.

When music, heavenly maid, was young,
While yet in early Greece she sung,
The passions oft, to hear her shell,
Thronged around her magic cell,
Exulting, trembling, raging, fainting,
Possest beyond the Muse's painting:
By turns they felt the glowing mind
Disturbed, delighted, raised, refined;
Till once, 'tis said, when all were fired,
Filled with fury, rapt, inspired,
From the supporting myrtles round
They snatched her instruments of sound;
And, as they oft had heard apart
Sweet lessons of her forceful art,
Each (for madness ruled the hour)
Would prove his own expressive power.[28]

Even the spirit of good *bourgeois* and opulent bankers, having got the Doctrine of Election and the king both in their places, and reason where they wanted it, might wish to escape it now and then: as patrons of painters who portrayed nature in the heroic mood of "extraordianry accidents, rocks, torrents, mountains"; as admirers of the works of dead architects, "even though their structures were in the Gothic style and half in ruins";[29] or in gardens to which art had given "an air of disorder, caprice, even of negligence." [80] "To live without passions is to sleep all one's life, and to dream that one drinks, eats, walks, sleeps." [81]

---

[27] For "Decret relatif à la fabrication de la monnaie provenant du métal des cloches" (a reasonable statement of financial values incident to religion) see, Robinet, *Le Mouvement Religieux à Paris pendant la Revolution,* II, 401.

[28] Collins (1721-1759), *The Passions, an Ode for Music.*

[29] The quotations from Diderot.

To the wilder spirit of the Renaissance, conscious of struggle and disorder in nature and man, Shakespeare's Prospero (of *The Tempest*) might speak with patronizing beneficence, in the person of Caliban:

I pitied thee,
Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour
One thing or another. When thou didst not, savage,
Know thy own meaning, but wouldst gabble like
A thing most brutish, I endow'd thy purposes
With words that made them known.

But now, in moods, Caliban might turn upon his master:

You taught me language, and my profit on't
Is, I know how to curse. The red plague rid you
For learning me your language.[82]

The outstanding prophet of this new mood was, of course, Jean Jacques Rousseau, whose vagabond, inconsequential life spawned with sincere eloquence of feeling a new gospel, which seemed in ways but a mockery of the Age of Reason, and people listening wondered sometimes, as expressed oddly enough by a poet of the same surname:

Quel est le moins barbare,
D'une raison de vous égare
Ou d'un instinct qui le conduit?[83]

Rousseau's influence went farther than we can follow it here. No one person more than he influenced the French Revolution, where the deliberations of legislators were looked down upon by the two busts, one of Brutus, the other his. In philosophy he was for a time the friend of Hume, and he was with Hume one of the definitive influences molding the final form of Kant's thought. It was not, indeed, that what he said was so new, but he put with sincerity eloquence and the richness of genius a something people had begun to feel, and this feeling had considerable bearing upon religion.

---

[80] The middle of the eighteenth century was marked by the beginning of taste for the *wild,* or what came to be known as *English gardens.*

[81] Madame de Puissieux (1750), quoted from Mornet, *Le Rousseauisme avant Rousseau.*

[82] *The Tempest,* Act I, scene ii.

[83] J. B. Rousseau, *Ode à M. le Marquis de le Fare.*

All his life Rousseau was religious. For a little time his friends in Paris, Diderot and the Encyclopedists, had "disquieted" his faith, but, though he found no good answer to their arguments, "I felt," he wrote, "that there must be one." His father "had much religion," and early inspired him with religious sentiments, with which, as he says, he was penetrated.[34] His father's religion, however, despite his long residence in Geneva, partook neither of the moral sternness of Calvinism, nor of that of the religion of nature. From his father, who fled Geneva and family cares, as the result of a quarrel with a retired military officer, the religious influence passed to one Madame de Warens, who had so softened a stony place in good Catholic theology as not to take literally or seriously a doctrine of eternal punishment.

Rousseau was logical enough to see that, without this belief the whole doctrine of original sin and redemption, the whole system of traditional Christianity, and with it Catholicism entire, fell to the ground. As for himself, doctrines played little part in what drew and held him to religion. He believed in religion, because he believed in the sort of emotions it evoked; and also because he believed in morals, as one who had weakly, willfully, and passionately done almost everything that morals usually condemned. "There are no necessary books," he wrote, "save those of religion; the only books which I have never condemned."

But there was still another reason for Rousseau's devotion to religion, which was intellectual. The deists and atheists had rejected, not only theology, but the sort of abstractions which previous metaphysics had dealt in. Now Rousseau rejected the abstractions of the deists and atheists; teaching, in harmony with the rest of his thought, a return to the moral instinct, the unspoiled conscience, that was supposed to preside over the morality of simple folk undegenerated by civilization. "All the law of nature is but a chimera, if it is not founded upon the natural need of the human heart."

---

[34] *Confessions,* book ii.

> Too often reason deceives us; we have acquired but too adequate right to accuse her; but the conscience never deceives. Conscience is the true guide of man: is to the soul that which instinct is to the body.[35]

We cannot here follow the complete expression of Rousseau's religious thought, nor must we expect it to round out consistently. It plays, to be sure, reason against both miracles and dogma, even while resting faith in reason's fallibility. It does, however, return, by the way of instinct, or feeling, to a conviction as to the underlying truth of the Christian Gospel:

> The sacredness of the Gospel is an argument which speaks to my heart. . . . Regard the books of the philosophers with all their pomp: how petty they are in comparison with it! [36]

And so, in a new and strange way, one returns to something not altogether other than Luther's doctrine of a seed of faith planted in the human soul. But how altered! And what prophetic alterations!

For Luther, state and cult existed alike for the Christian development and nurture of the citizens. For Rousseau, the public cult existed for the preservation of order in the state. Save for this the forms of worship were immaterial, and each man must follow the forms prescribed by the political power underneath which he lived. External religious authority, of sacred books, of all books, and of Church as well, was swept aside. "Always books! What madness!" And, before these books were written, he asks, where did men learn their duties? Who but the Church decides that the Church has the right to decide? [37]

And when we turn from the question of authority to ask where Rousseau's conscience, undoubtedly as he would have agreed the plantation of God, links with Luther's faith, what havoc do we find? If the God-given conscience that saved were as generously distributed among souls as were instincts among bodies, all eternal distinction between elect and reprobate was obliterated with a wet sponge. "God rejects no sort of homage whatsoever, provided it be sincere, under whatever form it is offered."

---

[35] *Émile,* book iv. Profession de Foi du Vicaire Savoyard.

[36] *Ibid.*

[37] *Ibid.*

This side of Rousseau's thought could hardly be allowed, even when joined with the injunction to follow the prescribed cult of one's country. Indeed elsewhere, across the channel, something decidedly less than this was looked upon with decided disapproval. Election had become something of a vested interest, and people were not to be saved indiscriminately, even though they were desirous of remaining within the prescribed religious boundaries of the country.

For some time before May 24, 1738, a certain John Wesley had borne an intolerable burden of unpardoned sin, despite the fact that for quite a dozen years he had been working as a zealous, intelligent, and apparently attractive clergyman of the Church of England. On the surface the experience which suddenly gave him —in a room where a band of good but too zealous members of the Church of England were accustomed to meet for prayer, Bible reading, and mutual exhortation—a personal conviction as to the efficacy of the saving grace of Christ might have been mistaken for the experience of *vocation* which, according to Calvinistic theology, was supposed to be a sign of election. Its validity in this case, however, soon began to be questioned, particularly when Wesley began to spread his good-tidings abroad in the open air, declaring to everybody without distinction,[38] that the grace of God could save anyone who accepted it, even though they accepted it in an open field or in a public square. Wesley himself confessed that at the beginning this possibility seemed a little strange to him.

> I could scarcely reconcile myself to this strange way of preaching in the fields . . . all my life, till very lately, so tenacious of every point

---

[38] Whitfield, Wesley's early associate, split with Wesley because the latter disputed the exclusiveness of election.

> relating to decency and order, that I should have thought the saving of souls almost a sin, if it had not been done in church.

Wesley's methods were so objectionable, both to the Church of England and to dissenting bodies, that Wesley's adherents were refused admission to the communion table in several places, until finally his brother decided to administer it himself. His doing so led to further and more decided acts of disapproval which in the end forced a body of Christians, desirous of producing in as many as possible somewhat that experience which in Martin Luther had done much to occasion the Reformation and upon which Calvin had attempted to base his doctrine of election, to leave the Church of England and form a separate organization of their own. There were now two types of election, and little doubt as to which of the two was more respectable. Explosively emotional religion would not go among the more palpably elect. Election was no longer an experience but a habit, and a very orderly habit, of mind.

Meanwhile, upon the very eve of the French Revolution, which was to be the melting pot into which all religious-political ideas were to be tossed, stirred up with the ladle of reason, to emit an odor that would frighten all of Europe, a surprising drama was enacted on behalf of those potentates who still ruled by virtue of the divine right of kings.

It began in a relatively unimportant and very Catholic country, Portugal, and was directed against an institution with easy and influential access to the ears and consciences of an overwhelmingly large portion of the Catholic nobility of Europe: the Jesuit Company.

This revolutionary movement was set in motion by one Sebastian Carvalho, of relatively humble birth, but destined to rise, until he had become First Minister of the Portuguese monarch, and Marquis de Pombal. It is said to have been inspired in England, where Pombal, as *chargé d'affaires* of the Portuguese embassy, but snubbed by Portuguese blue bloods (*sangre azul*) despite the fact that he had already abducted and married a daughter of their class, discovered that there was a country in which the aristocracy easily absorbed those who were evidently upon the rise.[39] He returned to Portugal with a program which involved the humbling of aristocrats and Jesuits; caught a few of the former in some sort of a plot against the king, involved the latter with them; and hardly were some aristocrats tried and beheaded for treason before the Jesuits found themselves banished by decree from Portugal (1759).

It was no new thing for the Jesuits to be looked upon with suspicion by monarchs and their ministers, and yet, wherever the hand of some prince had fallen heavy upon them, they seem always to have found a way back again, close to his ear and elbow. They were hated by the philosophers, but it was not as one of the enlightened that Pombal acted, but rather in the puritan spirit, accusing them of behavior inconsistent with their vows, exposing them finally as incompetent and tricky in their financial transactions.

In France he found unexpected assistance, first from Madame de Pompadour, mistress of the king, then from the fact that, at an opportune moment, a bank created by a Jesuit father in Martinique became involved in rash speculation and failed financially. In rather rapid succession the Jesuits were expelled from France, Spain, Naples and Parma, four other Bourbon kingdoms, as well as Portugal. Relations between Portugal and Rome were severed.[40] In the midst of this situation the Pope (Clement XIII) died. His policies had been largely molded by the Jesuits, and when at first France had attempted the less radical action of establishing the Jesuits in France under a separate head, he had replied, "let them be as they are, or not at all." After his death the five Bourbon monarchs thrust their influence into the conclave convened to elect his successor, determined to dissolve the company, and not to see a new pope elected on any other terms. The emperor, appealed to for assistance by cardinals not devoted to the Bourbon policy, preferred to stand aside and let things take their course, and when finally a successor to Clement XIII was elected, it was understood that he was to dissolve the Jesuits. The new pope (Clement XIV) temporized, entangled himself in a definite commitment to the King of Spain, and finally, as a secret portion of the agreement which resumed relations between Rome and Portugal, was led to the point of decreeing their dissolution. Then finally another strange thing happened—large numbers of Jesuits, who refused to obey the decree which dissolved their order, took refuge in Protestant Prussia, under a prince of the enlightenment, Frederick II; and other large numbers were made not less welcome by an empress of the enlightenment, Catherine II of Russia, while England was suspected of assisting others in American colonies of Spain and Portugal, in hopes of stirring up insurrection.

---

[39] Such is the opinion of St. Priest, *Histoire de la Chute des Jesuites.*

[40] A Jesuit author claims that Pombal wished to set up a separate church in Portugal (De Ravignon, *Clement XIII et Clement XIV,* 88). It is doubtful that his policy ever went so far as considering such an eventuality. The whole policy of the five monarchies, and here the emperor was with them, was one of putting the pope in his place.

For a time, after the suppression of the Jesuits, European monarchs in Catholic countries breathed a little easier. It seemed they had at once done two things—found a scapegoat upon which to unload some of the wrath which the apostles of reason had long hurled against religious tyranny and superstition, and themselves removed from their way one of the important religious impediments to their absolute power. As for the papacy, it too had far less need of the company than previously, and the shock over, they were content to see laid at rest an institution which had brought down often the wrath of kings upon the Church. But what a short period of peace these monarchs were to enjoy! They had but hung and buried a figure stuffed with straw. The real specter to be feared was above ground. The enlightenment had turned from attacking priests and religion, to attack nobles, kings, and political privilege. Religion, its superstitions and abuses, had been the clarion cry which awoke the people in the sixteenth century. But now it was another that touched the populace: "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity!" The French Revolution was upon their backs, and was to prove that those monarchs who had harbored, not those who had evicted the Jesuits, were the prophets of religion's next rôle in politics.

# LX

The religious, or irreligious, conceptions of a Voltaire, or of a Rousseau, might have remained eternally among the clouds of the metaphysical heavens; the French Revolution brought them down to earth. From chimeras or paradoxes they became realities, and realities to be reckoned with. Mere abstractions yesterday, they had taken form and life; had become interests and passions.[1]

We have discussed, in the preceding chapter, certain tendencies of thought of a character such as to work dissolution among traditional religious ideas, and loosen the hold of Christian religious institutions upon the minds and actions of men and women. The effect of these ideas, however, must not be exaggerated. But a very small minority of the population of France even, where the ideas found toward the end of the eighteenth century more and more free and radical discussion, were really touched by them. The large majority, the common people almost *en masse,* still retained the same sort of varying faith and loyalty, with surface modifications, and differences of emotional stress, due to changing material conditions, as they had retained for centuries. Indeed the seventeenth century had paid more attention than any century previously in Catholic countries to the religion of the poorer classes, and nowhere as conspicuously as in France. Several kings in succession had whittled away at the vested property rights of the Church, and in France the institution was far poorer than it had been in centuries a bit farther back.

Leaving aside the poor, in the overwhelming majority Catholic, the upper strata of society were more religiously divided. The small minority of Protestants were mostly of the middle class. Jansenism had become a sect which joined its social and political force to a large degree with the still older forces of Gallicanism. So, roughly, it may be said that the more important classes socially were divided among Ultramontane, or Catholics of predominantly papal loyalty; Gallican, who carried on the tradition of freedom of French Catholicism from papal domination in many local matters, Jansenism, which mingled matters of theological doctrine with their compromised loyalty to Rome; Protestant, who took to some of the ideals of the Age of Reason without much disturbance; and finally, the active minority of deists and atheists, whose ideas had penetrated many places among the aristocracy, had won a not inconsiderable number of the clergy, and many among the lawyers, journalists, and smaller leaders of public opinion everywhere.

---

[1] Giraud, *Le Christianisme de Chateaubriand,* I, 133.

When Louis XVI finally felt it necessary to yield to the growing demand for a summoning of the *États Généraux,* all these factors were to be loosed. It caused misgivings naturally.

> Alas! all is lost! What may one not fear for religion, in a Catholic realm, governed by a minister who is both philosopher and Protestant? And what may not be the result of an assembly as tumultuous as the States General, at a time when the reins of subordination and obedience are already much weakened? What is to become of our fair and hallowed institutions? [2]

The beginnings were nevertheless not particularly menacing upon the surface. When election time came in Paris, for the choice of delegates; even after the fall of the Bastille, the citizen soldiers went ceremoniously to Church, for the traditional blessing upon their actions, or guidance in what they intended. In an *ex voto,* after the fall of the Bastille, St. Genevieve, patron saint of Paris, was represented beside an exterminating angel, as part of a rude painting of the capture.[3] Many priests formed part of the *Garde Nationale,* an improvised citizen soldiery, and took part in the new municipal governing forces. Also civil officials often mounted pulpits, at Paris and elsewhere, to address the people upon public questions.[4]

---

[2] Quoting M. Emery, Superior of the Seminary of St. Sulpice. Meric, *Histoire de M. Emery, et de l'Église de France pendant La Revolution,* I, 131.

[3] Robinet, *Le Mouvement Religieux à Paris pendant la Revolution,* I, 106.

[4] Same work and page. This study abounds in documents, and has been used other places, where it will be only encumbering to quote it always.

The entering wedge of attack upon established Catholicism was by way of its revenues and properties: tithes were suppressed (and who minds being shorn of the duty of paying a tax?), a movement began to alienate properties of the ecclesiastical institution, and largely at the first by transferring some property used ostensibly at least for charitable purposes, to government control. Public hospitals, under religious control, were found in frightful condition. (It is probably fair to say that any social housekeeping, under any régime, is likely to discover much in such institutions worthy of reform.) At all events, there was little in such movements to disturb anyone save ecclesiastics, and the tide was running strong and rather popularly toward the overthrowing of old vested abuses.

The real trouble began as a result of that idea, strong among all but the more radical of the reasoning reformers, that religion was necessary, or at least of great value, to a state. Active reformers are usually in a large measure naïve, and it seemed a relatively simple thing to reform some outstanding abuses, particularly such as transferred money from the pockets of clerics to those of the citizens generally by way of the national purse; effect economies in religion, by lessening the number of supernumerary prelates and minor clergy; and to transfer all the social and quasi-political prerogatives of the clerics to state control, by binding the clergy to the state by an oath of allegiance, merely eliminating from active service and revenue those who refused to take it.

The act which was supposed to bring all this about was a Civil Constitution of the Clergy; a compromise so far as the anti-religious radicals were concerned, but acceptable in principle to the deists who believed in the social efficacy of religion, and also to Protestants, Gallicans and Jansenists in general, and which gained a tardy and equivocal acceptance from Louis XVI. Some of the clergy hastened to sign it, some immediately resigned their charges, in order to be freed from the obligation of either signing or refusing, some, and the prelates in large number, considered it their first duty to "await with confidence the response of the successor of St. Peter." The pope waited three months, almost, before openly condemning the Civil Constitution, attempting first to work privately through the king.

After the open condemnation of the pope an uncomfortably large number of the parish clergy did refuse to sign, and some signers retracted their acceptance. With few exceptions[5] the archbishops and bishops refused to sign. Although the Constitution reduced the number of dioceses considerably, there were still not enough bishops who had signed to provide the necessary bishops, and some of the "juror" bishops, most prominent of all Talleyrand, still a cleric and by title Bishop of Autun, proceeded to consecrate new bishops who, without papal sanction, were schismatic, and intruders. Those priests who signed had meanwhile also been declared schismatic intruders by papal decree, and the power of the papal see, both openly and unostentatiously, was thrown against the Revolution. There were now two Catholic Churches in France, and it soon became necessary, "even to the most moderate" among the clergy of Roman allegiance, to inform the faithful Catholics as to the religious situation which had been brought about. Instructions were circulated, as warnings, in tracts of many sorts. A quotation from one, in verse, will serve:

Aux vrais pasteurs tu montreras
Un inflexible attachement.
D'eux seuls toujours tu recevras
Les sacrements, l'enseignement.
Des schismatiques tu fuiras
Messe, sermons également,
Et dans ta maison tu prieras
Si tu ne peux autrement.[6]

Those clergy who took the oath of fidelity to the Civil Constitution were, naturally, of more various types of opinion than those who refused. Some put their pastoral responsibility before any other thing, pope included; some put patriotism first; some signed to avoid trouble or hoping for advancement; some because they hated popes and kings, and leaned toward the new philosophy. Some were accepted by their old flocks, or new ones to which they were sent; some were repudiated. But two forces were at work to undermine the *constitutional* Catholic Church: one was Rome, the other was the growing antireligious character of revolutionary leadership. For, meanwhile, in a series of events which cannot be recounted here, Louis XVI, after a number of foolish, vacillating, and by no means straightforward gestures, was pushed aside, and then more permanently out, by means of the scaffold. The army of nobles on the other side of various boundaries of France, increased. A religious revolution broke out in the west-center of France (the Vendée) too stubborn to be effectively repressed. More and more *récusant* clergy went to join the noble *émigrés*. Finally a decree banished all clergy who had not signed the oath of civil allegiance.

---

[5] Bliard, *Jureurs et Insermentes, d'après les dossiers du tribunal revolutionaire,* 16, says only seven out of one hundred and fifty-nine then living in France.

[6] *Ibid.,* 311. Roughly translated: "You will exhibit an inflexible attachment to the *true* shepherds. Always only from them will you accept sacraments and instruction. Schismatics you will shun, their masses and their sermons, praying in your own houses, if you cannot elsewhere."

With this decree of banishment, we are already at the beginning of the Commune, the Reign of Terror immediately before. Some of the clergy faithful still to Rome remained, held by a sense of duty to minister clandestinely to some little flock. The number of these however was small in comparison with the number of the constitutional clergy. But the oath of political allegiance was no longer a protection to priests. Though romance and romantic history has had more to say about nobles who suffered and died during the Terror, the clerics had rather a worse time of it than they, since for one thing there were more of them remaining in France. Thousands of priests, of whom the majority were *constitutional,* were thrown into prison, most of them to go immediately to the scaffold. At the prison established at the Seminary of St. Firmin, ninety-one priests imprisoned, seventy-six executed; at the house of Carmelites, one hundred and fifty arrested, one hundred and twenty executed—so the records run.[7]

The people still persisted in their superstitious rites and the wild women of the Terror were not all of them wild republicans. A Breton woman of the people demanded of an official the cups habitually used to collect money, for the clothing and adornment of a venerated image of the Virgin; and, when refused, she shook her fist in the official's face, with some vile oaths, and the further suggestion that, if women ran things, they would arrange better.[8]

---

[7] Robinet, II, 290, gives further statistics.

The Revolution had piled new difficulties in its path. Having first alienated all Catholics who had given but outward loyalty, if any at all, to the constitutional church because of conviction or of fear for their eternal welfare threatened by a pope, the Revolution now had alienated all others who clung to old religious habits or beliefs. Beyond the border Ultramontane clergy joined hands with royalists, Gallicanism died. In France many constitutional clergy, in their suffering, regretted their desertion of Rome. The Terror was more and more obliged to fight every atom of Catholic conviction or habit in France.

Meanwhile, in political societies and in the halls of legislative assembly, orators proclaimed all sorts of theories about religion, and various degrees of insult directed against religious institutions and practices in general. An abbé of revolutionary sympathy announced a rose-colored dream of Neo-Christianity:

> The Universe will be free; all thrones overturned; the virility of the nations announces itself, the age of reason for humanity advances. We are suffering the last storms of the childhood of the world. Social wisdom will arise from the débris of tyrannical and servile passions which have ruled the ignorance of nations. Happiness will be born of the marriage of light and truth. Society will embrace Nature. Freed from all chains, we shall be blessed with all material things. Fraternity will rebind the human family, and equality before the law will finally render man the sovereign of the earth.[9]

The Feast of the Epiphany was to become the Feast of Neighborliness, and so in turn it was proposed to substitute feasts suggestive of the current republican ideas for all the important Christian festivals.

Some suggested that those who still wanted religion of the Christian sort, should pay for it themselves, all state support being withdrawn from the religious bodies which the Constitution had provided for. André Chénier, the poet, suggested that the religious difficulties might be removed, all of them, by allowing every man to choose whatever religion he liked, or chose to invent, paying for the support of that one, and no other. It was however all too clear to the wisest heads that the majority of the people wished the old rites to be celebrated in the old manner, and that on the other hand they could not be made to pay for them. At Christmas, 1792, an order was sent forth that the churches were to be closed from the day preceding to the day following the feast. It was very generally disobeyed and caused many violent disturbances.

---

[8] Robinet gives this incident in documentary form, II, 290.
[9] Robinet, II, 223-224.

> The proletariate [observes Robinet], still refractory to modern ideas and sentiments . . . anchored in the supernatural, secularly attached by superstition and servitude to king, nobles, and priests, were, one might say, the greatest obstacle to a philosophical revolution, which they followed only little by little, and to which they submitted often only when forced.[10]

Robespierre, deist by conviction, had a plan. He believed that religion was an almost essential bond of the state, and should be under state control. He determined to manufacture one to serve the contemporary conditions. In 1794 he presented to the Assembly a report "On the relation of religious ideas and morals to republican principles, etc." In presenting it he stated:

> The sole basis of civil society is morality. . . . I do not know how it comes about that nature should suggest to men fictions more useful than the realities; and, if the existence of God, if the immortality of the soul were but dreams, they would still be the most beautiful conceptions of the human spirit. . . . In the eyes of the legislator, all that is useful in the world, and of practical good, is the truth. The idea of a Supreme Being, and of the immortality of the soul, is a continual appeal to justice: it is therefore sociable and republican.

Robespierre was, at this moment, in a unique situation. He was before an assembly, by no means united, because it embraced atheists, deists, *theophilanthropoi,* ecclesiastics who were in favor of constitutional reform, though these divided as Protestants and Catholics, and others whose deepest allegiance still held with Rome. It was, none the less, an assembly ready to sweep the slate clean and build anew, religion as well as other things. So now, the religion of nature became the official religion of the State: "The French people recognize the existence of God, and the immortality of the soul," they voted.

---

[10] Robinet, II, 312.

After the delegated legislative representatives of the French nation had decreed recognition of God and the immortality of the soul, they set about, under the inspiration of Robespierre, to manufacture an appropriate cult to give expression to this belief in a more modern form. The seven-day week was done away, to be superseded by the *decade,* or ten-day week. The Cathedral of Notre Dame became the Temple of Reason. Besides four commemorative revolutionary festivals—one of which remains as the great national festival of France, in commemoration of the fall of the Bastille—they instituted thirty-six other festivals, at the end of each ten-day week. The first of these festivals was dedicated to the Supreme Being and Nature; others to the human race, the French people, the benefactors of humanity, Liberty, Equality, etc.

The first of these new festivals was elaborately arranged. At five in the morning trumpets sounded; at eight a cannon gave the signal for assembly. The various sections which were to take part gathered in the garden of the Tuileries (renamed, *le Jardin National*): on one side men with swords and branches of oak, on the other women with wreaths and baskets of flowers, in the middle the young men, armed with guns and grouped about a standard. A salvo of artillery announced the arrival of the governing assembly. Robespierre arose and invoked the Supreme Being. The people sang a hymn composed for the occasion:

Père de l'Univers, suprême intelligence,
Bienfaiteur ignoré des aveugles mortels,
Tu revelas ton être à la reconnaissance
Que seule élève tes autels.

Ton temple est sur les monts, dans les
airs, sur les ondes,
Tu n'as pas de passé, tu n'as pas d'avenir,
Et, sans les occuper, tu remplis tous
les mondes
Que ne peuvent te contenir.

Before the altar they had arranged to burn the image of Atheism, surrounded by Ambition, Egoism, and Discord. Robespierre himself set the fire alight. Then, in solemn procession, they filed across the Seine to the Champ de Mars (also renamed *le Champ de Réunion*), where a mountain had been erected, with the Tree of Liberty on its summit. Caparisoned oxen drew about the base of this impressive mountain (*montaigne immense*) a draped car, surmounted by a female figure representing Agriculture, and surrounded with implements and products of tillage.

This passed off for once with some enthusiasm, but the cult made no deep impression. It seemed indeed a little naïve for an Age of Reason. Not long afterwards Robespierre fell. The Directory following granted freedom of worship, removing government support from any cult whatsoever, but attempting to keep alive the national cult, and supporting with legislation which made its observance obligatory the ten-day week, as "one of the institutions most appropriate to encourage forgetfulness, even to its last vestiges, of the old royal and sacerdotal régime." This attempt lasted less than a year, and among various continuing parties and cleavages surrounding the question of religion, the constitutional Catholic Church made continual gains.

One thing the Directory did to encourage the restitution of unity among those who remained Catholic. It drew up a form of declaration of loyalty to the state to which even the exiled pre-Revolutionary archbishop of Paris authorized subscription. In Paris subscription went better than many places in the provinces.

> Everyone's head is turned upside-down . . . strained imaginations see everything black. They seem to believe themselves most Catholic in proportion as they close their eyes to the light, and reject all councils of prudence. Not alone at Saint Flour, but many other places, people have refused submission.[11]

With the coming of Napoleon to power this was to change. As general for the Directory he had, to be sure, made war against the pope's temporal possession, but on the other hand he had conspicuously refrained from attacking the city of Rome. Loyal Catholics considered him as an enemy of the Church. But, a few days before the battle of Marengo, in 1800, in an address to the assembled clergy of Milan, he paved the way for conciliation with the pope. And, while Paris was still exulting over this military victory, a fiery preacher ascending the pulpit of a church in the center of Paris (St. Roch) chose as his text the passage concerning the Roman centurion who, struck by the prodigies surrounding the Crucifixion, became convinced that Jesus was truly the Son of God. Then the preacher turned the imagination of his congregation toward Italy, where a triumphant conqueror had suddenly seen the light of truth, and turned back to the bosom of the Church. The effect of this sermon was electrical, but not on all sides favoring. As the priest departed from the church he was arrested, conducted to the insane asylum, where for a week he wore the costume prescribed for the inmates.[12] His prediction, however, proved in a sense to be true. Shortly after the *coup d'état* in which Bonaparte set himself alone at the head of the nation, imperial and papal diplomats got together to arrange a new *concordat,* under which France might return to the old religion.

---

[11] Letter of M. Emery, one of those commissioned by the Archbishop of Paris to persuade clergy of that diocese to accept the new oath.

The Concordat itself need hardly interest us, but prefixed to it, upon its publication, there was a long apologetic essay, which knit it to the attempted reforms of the Revolution, and to the philosophies out of which the Revolution had sprung, and was intended to convince the doubters and reformers with whom Napoleon's career had been so clearly connected. Closely following there came a longer apologetic, written in quite another key, highly approved by the emperor, and of a character such as to warm the Christian enthusiasm of a far broader mass. The two documents together offer such an introduction to the question of Christianity in the nineteenth century as it would be elsewhere difficult to find within so small a compass.

"It is easier to formulate laws than to win the assent of minds and change opinions," the preface to the Concordat confesses at the outset.

---

[12] Portalis, *Discours, Rapports et Travaux Inédits sur le Concordat de 1801, etc.,* xlviii. This preacher, the Abbé Fournier, later became a chaplain of the Emperor.

> Too confident of our acquired light of intelligence, vain of the degree of perfection to which we have attained, we imagine that, with no danger whatever to the common good, we may forthwith renounce everything that we call *antiquated prejudices,* and separate ourselves in a moment (*brusquement*) from everything that has civilized us. From this arises the indifference of our age to everything not connected with the sciences or the arts, with the machineries (*moyens*) of industry and commerce which have been so happily developed in our time, or with those matters of political economy and politics, upon which solely we appear to base the prosperity of states.

Laws, to be sure, it continues, may regulate certain actions, but religion embraces all. Laws merely govern the use of limbs; religion regulates the heart. Laws relate only to citizens; religion lays hold upon the man entire.

Neither a system of morals of philosophical basis only, nor a religion which appeals to the intelligence alone are sufficient. As for morals, the mass demands an authority, is more moved by things commanded than by propositions proven. "Men in general need to be fixed: need maxims rather than demonstrations." For this, there need not necessarily be one single religion, because, though the different positive religions may not resemble one another in their dogmas and ceremonies, "the principle articles of natural morals constitute the foundation of all the positive religions"; and so, even under a variety of religions, "the maxims and virtues most necessary to the conservation of social order are everywhere safeguarded by religious sentiments and by the conscience."

Moreover, another advantage of positive religions is the linkage of morals with rites and ceremonies. Morals consist not only in thinking well, but in acting well, and good actions are assured only by good habits. To habitually perform acts which suggest the idea of virtue leads to the love of virtue itself. To deny the utility of religious rites and practices as an influence upon morals, would be to deny the influences of sense impressions upon beings which are not "pure mind," and to deny the power of habit.

> Can a religion which does not speak to the eye, and to the imagination, maintain an empire over souls? . . . Have not useful truths need of being consecrated by salutary institutions? . . . If there be something stable and generally admitted as to the existence and unity of God, as to the nature and destiny of man, is it not among those who profess a cult, and are united among themselves by the bonds of a positive religion?

Even though abuses may arise among the religious, and in religion, the same is also possible in philosophy. "Positive religion is a dyke, a barrier which alone can protect us against the torrent of false and more or less dangerous opinions, which the delirium of human reason may invent." And here religion has this advantage, that it has its roots in infancy, which are never entirely eradicated. Even the infidel is less incredulous than he appears. Moreover science "will never be the portion of more than a small number, but with religion one may be instructed without being learned."

Moreover, religions cannot be fabricated. Their authority rests in the fact that they are believed to be the work of God, and so the wise government abstains from the attempt to improve upon, and accepts, existent religions.

In the above we have a philosophy of religion for the ruling classes of society, worked out with many hints based upon recent experience and disappointed hopes. It to be sure rather gives away the secret, and was neither suited nor intended to cover the whole field, but rather as an excuse to those who might feel the action of the emperor a step backward. Shortly afterwards the broad apologetic for everyone was launched: the *Génie du christianisme* of Chateaubriand, who happened also to be a literary genius who created at the same time one of the masterpieces of French literature, and one of the greatest, and along with Goethe's *Faust* the most comprehensive literary document of the romantic period in European literature. What interests us here is merely the light it throws and the influence it exerted, upon the religious atmosphere at the dawn of the nineteenth century.

Chateaubriand was born a Breton. In Brittany, another Breton (Renan) said, "joy even is a little gloomy." Sea, woods, small hills, bare brushy wastes, gloomy ponds, granite rock everywhere cropping—the Bretons are known to be at once hard and obstinate, and the most persistent idealizing and fanciful dreamers. Chateaubriand, with all his too-ready pliancy, was a little hard underneath, and could be cruel; he was also a rich, sensitive, impressionable, and persistent dreamer, whose dreams were always touched with melancholy. Unable to stop for choice among the multitude of examples of this in his work, perhaps a single phrase sums up the dreamer, and the essential melancholy forced upon his dreams: "The imagination is rich, abundant, marvelous; existence poor, dry and disenchanted. With a heart full one lives in an earth empty." [18]

He was also a noble, who had passed the stormy days of the Revolution in exile, much of the time in North America.

He returned to Europe to find, not only a longing for peace and the restoration of order; but, as Napoleon soon proved by offering himself, also longing for something to believe in: *"C'est un terrible luxe, l'incrédulité,"* someone had said in the midst of the eighteenth century. Chateaubriand, during some years of doubt, deism, etc., had doubtless also felt somewhat the same. At all events he was converted, toward the latter part of the Revolutionary period, and the circumstances of this conversion introduce some further facts of biographical interest here.

While himself an exile, his family suffered bitterly in the Terror. A brother died upon the scaffold, his mother was long imprisoned in the Conciergerie, and died almost immediately after release; his two sisters and his wife were also both for a time prisoners. He attributed his conversion to a long letter from his sister Julie, his closest friend, informing him of his mother's release and death.

It was from this conversion that his *Génie du christianisme* sprang. It is a long and eloquent apology for Christian civilization. He had been fitted to deal with some measure of theology, by an education which proposed to prepare him for clerical orders, as a member of the Knights of Malta, in expectancy of which he had indeed received the tonsure of one of the lower orders of the clergy before influences of the Age of Reason turned him aside. His apology, however, was to be no treatise of theological argument, but a full, rich, comprehensive encomium upon "the beauties of Christianity," as indeed its subtitle sets forth.

---

[18] *Génie du christianisme,* Part II, book iii, chap. ix.

Chateaubriand's apologetic journey is a long one, which took him generally speaking through the entire content of his knowledge, and called upon practically every element of his romantic imagination and experience—beside a beaver dam, or in a tremendous forest of the Canadian Northwest, for example. We cannot follow him here, even to the extent of noting chapter headings, which range through theology, cult, poetry, art, history, oratory, ethics, law, everywhere; making comparison most often between pagan and Christian civilization, in its varied works of different sorts, and concluding that it was "very probable that, but for Christianity, the shipwreck of society and enlightenment would have been total." [14]

What is more important is to note that it was an apology for the beginning of the nineteenth century, and the particular sort of an apology that the beginning of the nineteenth century wanted. You will not find the poignant melancholy of Keats, fainting for beauty in the very sublimation of the mood of romantic sentiment, lofty etherial brooding upon beauty in a gossamer of glimpsed conception, or poured liquid from a song bird's throat as in Shelley. You will, however, find rocks, tombs, ruins, forests, mountains, legends, pageants, sacraments, altar candles, vestments, romantic heroes, heroines, hearthstones—anything you will among all that this century turned to, to cure a world-sickness which was for a time so difficult to face without a bit of cloud or costuming. Everyone could not pine with Keats or soar with Shelley, but everyone could find something to comfort him or her in the *Génie du christianisme.* Gothic ruins and empire furniture both might find a place, since pomp was not obliged to breed melancholy save before pompous tombs.

Keats was soon to write:

---

[14] *Ibid.,* IV, vi, chap. xii.

When old age shall this generation waste
Thou shalt remain, in midst of other woe
Than ours, a friend of man, to whom thou say'st,
"Beauty is truth, and truth beauty"—that is all
Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know.

Despite exaggerated claims, there was something Greek about Keats's conception of beauty. In his "Ode on a Grecian Urn," and in the first line of "Endymion," we are reminded of beauty as something that lasts, outlasts, and may be counted upon in the flux of change. But the beauty of which Chateaubriand had more to say, and to which the age took more readily, was not in things themselves, but in the things such things can make you feel.[15] And, above all, it was in mystery.

> There is nothing of beauty, of gentleness, or of grandeur in life, save the mysterious. The most marvelous sentiments are those which move us a bit confusedly. . . . One might even say that the hearts that love understand each other in a whisper, and but half, and that they are but half-opened. Innocence, in its turn, which is but a holy ignorance, is it not the most ineffable mystery? Infancy is happy only because it knows nothing, and old age is miserable, just because it knows everything.[16]

Religion so contemplated was no longer precisely a drama of salvation, but it might be a pleasant thing to contemplate after a stormy period. Also, the suggestion is, it is still pleasanter to contemplate because of the difficulty of getting near enough to understand it. Indeed who then realized better than the emperor soon to have most of Europe at his feet, that things grew imposing if one could not get near enough to them to understand?

We are not here attempting a complete judgment of a rich work of imaginative genius. The *Genie du christianisme* was by accident a work of genius, by opportunity a popular book; and of a popular book it is never so important to know what the full intention of the author was, as to know how it might conveniently serve a great number of people. With the assistance of Chateaubriand's work, and others it might inspire, one might be a Christian—and not necessarily even a Catholic—in some of the pleasantest moments of a generally otherwise occupied life.

---

[15] It is suggested to the interested reader, that Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* may be read as in a measure the portrayal of the effect of this type of *romantic* imagination in undermining a feminine character. He writes one place (quotation from memory, and may lack precision), "Étants sentimentales et pas artistes, ils cherchaient des sentiments, pas des paysages."

[16] *Ibid.,* I, chap. ii.

# LXI

THE Napoleonic Era trailed like an orgy across Europe; an orgy far more widespread and more socially dangerous than the French Revolution which had preceded it. Napoleon finally dead, a brooding prisoner upon an obscure island in mid-Atlantic, added but another note to the general bewilderment which followed. Society might conclude, as one who lived the period through remarked, that after this "anything is possible." [1]

> There is a terrible danger in facing the confines of possibility, for the imagination goes even still beyond. It is one thing to say "This might happen," and another to say "This has happened": the latter is the first bite of the dog.[2]

A whole social system, it seemed, might be disrupted; another might be substituted almost overnight; this to collapse in turn like a pricked bubble. Such things had happened, and within the scope of a single lifetime. Therefore they might happen again.

And so the memory of some thirty years, divided almost in the middle by the close of the eighteenth century, brooded in its effect over quite all of the first half of the nineteenth century. It preoccupied emotionally and speculatively the imagination of large masses, splitting them into groups, and disintegrating the reactions of individuals.

> Some said, "That which caused the fall of the Emperor was the fact that the people no longer wanted him." Others said, "The people wanted the king; no, they wanted liberty; no, they wanted reason; no, they wanted a constitution of the English type; no, it was not that but absolutism they wanted"; and then a last added: "No, it was nothing of all these they wanted, but rest.[3]

---

[1] L. Veron, *Mémoires d'un Bourgeois de Paris* (1800-1856), I, chap. iv.

[2] Alfred de Musset, *Confession d'un Enfant du Siècle,* 1836. De Musset was born in 1810.

[3] *Confession d'un Enfant du Siècle.*

Needless to say this situation had important bearing upon the temper of religious reactions. We have glanced at the Christian apology of Chateaubriand, written early in the reign of Napoleon. It was prophetic as to the place religion was to occupy in broadest sweep, but this flowing and flowery adventure among the beauties of Christianity covered many different attitudes, from one to another of which its facile, volatile, and adaptable author might himself easily slip. It set religion in an atmosphere, in a time when, as Veron remarks, "the Emperor refused genius but one thing only, freedom." Indeed "religion played a large rôle in official manners and customs." Servants of the imperial government were expected to maintain the gesture of respect for the established religious ceremonies, even though, as one official remarked concerning his own habit, they carried to church the *Contes* of La Fontaine as mass book.[4] Religion served excellently those who wished for peace, quiet, and something pleasant to think about, and was still expected to serve the cause of law and order. So religion was no longer, as in the eighteenth century, openly attacked, because it was expected to fortify the political power.

This, however, it could under Napoleon hardly do with much efficacy. His power was too blatantly new. Its origin and basis was too clearly evident, and fitted nowhere either into the traditional religious basis of government, or even into that free contractual basis of government the ideals of the eighteenth century had preached. And so, inevitably, people, instead of putting religion where Napoleon might have wished everyone save himself to put it, tended rather to give it much the same importance that he himself allowed it, neither impious nor atheist, but predominantly indifferent.[5] As early as 1817 this indifference inspires another comprehensive apology, even longer than that of Chateaubriand: the *Essai sur l'Indifference en matière de religion* of De Lamennais.

> It is vain to attempt to hide the fact, society in Europe advances rapidly toward a fatal crisis. The noises which rumble in its breast, the

---

[4] Veron, *Mémoires*.

[5] Veron remarks, "Cette société—n'était ni impie ni athée; elle vivait indifferente en matière de religion."

> blows which shake it, are not the most frightening symptoms Europe offers to the observer; but that indifferent lethargy into which we see it fall, that profound drowsiness, who will draw society from this? Who will breath upon these blanched bones to revivify them?[6]

With the Congress of Vienna in session, aiming to reëstablish the old governmental forms and powers which long tradition hallowed, this indifference might indeed have appeared troubling. Those who were bent upon dispersing ghostly memories of the Revolution and the Empire needed religion to help them; not lukewarm religion, but that which had gathered armies about deified princes, and swung incense pots before the shrines of prerogatives now shaken. And the number of those who needed such religion, for others if not themselves personally, was now larger than half a century earlier. New nobilities, new prerogatives, new wealth had arisen, needing the protection of social security and stability no less than the old. For a considerable number of persons who might have welcomed both the ideas and facts of the French Revolution, liberty, equality, and fraternity had now gone quite far enough. But this desire to see religion in some effective sense reestablished could count but little positively upon those merely who were interested in religion for the protection of their prerogatives and wealth. It needed zealots. It needed persons who believed passionately that social peace and security rested upon a divine basis, represented by ecclesiastics and nobles sanctified to rule over and protect society.

Of all this the restoration of the Bourbons in France was symbolic. It had been foreseen by one not precisely a Frenchman, but a Savoyard, even in the saddest period of the Revolution. Wearied after the fever of disorder and bloodshed, people would begin to wish only repose, and then, if a courier arrived in some provincial village or city, to announce that in Paris some party had seized the power in the name of his very sacred Majesty, the legitimate inheritor of the sanctified Capetian right to rule, people would begin to cry, "*Vive le roi.*"[7] Napoleon came between, yet after him the cry arose. It arose, but it arose with too little persistence and out of volatile enthusiasm bred of the still incomprehensible changes just behind, which had left the attitude that, since anything seemed possible, nothing should be accepted as tolerable which proved anywhere unsatisfactory.

---

[6] *Essai sur l'Indifference,* Introd.

[7] De Maistre, *Considerations sur La France,* from the chapter entitled, "Comment se fera la contre-revolution, si elle arrive."

And so the period between 1815 and 1848 divides, for politics and religion both, roughly into two equal parts, the former of which attempts to reinstate religion so far as possible in that relation to the social order which it had grown steadily to occupy all through the upward curve of developing medieval civilization, and from which the readjustments of the Reformation and the Counter Reformation had never intended to dislodge it.

We must attempt to comprehend this attempt, because failing to do so the later phenomena of those religious currents which were to dominate nineteenth-century European religion are immediately thrown, as they often have been thrown, in a distorted light.

The background of the Congress of Vienna and its attempt to reconstitute Europe was all the princes, nobilities, not to mention many well-to-do bourgeois of older or more recent place and fortune throughout Europe. The stage upon which this attempt worked itself out most clearly to ultimate failure was France. We have spoken of the restoration of the Bourbons in France as symbolic. So was the revolution of July, 1830, which installed and maintained for eighteen years the bourgeois monarchy of Louis Philippe. This almost bloodless revolution, so soon passed and over—matter only of days—was watched and caused troubled currents of fear and instability throughout Europe.[8] So too was the French Revolution of 1848 symbolic, with repercussions in many other European nations. Through all this period the religious atmosphere gradually changed. The changes were effected in a most important way by the introduction of religion into the political forces of Europe in a rôle not precisely that which it had ever up to then occupied.

Let us attempt first of all to get some glimpse of the attitude

[8] De Guichen, *La Revolution de Juillet 1830 et l'Europe.*

which motivated this attempt to renew a religious foundation for the sadly disturbed institutions of the "old régime," taking it as expressed, intelligently, with warmth, sincerity, and excellent poise, by the calmest reasoner among the three or four most important religious leaders of the restoration in France, in a work already referred to, by the Savoyard De Maistre.

De Maistre, writing as one not himself a Frenchman, from outside France while the Terror raged, speaks of the Revolution as a *miracle,* in which Providence chastised a nation which exercised in Europe a sacred position of authoritative influence (*une véritable magistrature*). In it he sees a succession of leaders obliged by forces which they neither comprehended nor could control, to follow varying tides of flux. Though praiseworthy according to human thinking, at bottom they are infinitely criminal.

> If one say: I embraced with good faith the French Revolution, for love of liberty and of my country; I believed in my soul and conscience that it would bring about the reform of abuses and the public good; we have nothing to say. But that eye for which all hearts become transparent does not miss the culpable fibril. . . .
>
> One of the greatest crimes it is possible to commit is without doubt an attack directed against the sovereign power (*la souveraineté*). If this sovereignty rest upon the head of some person, and that person falls victim before an attack directed against it, this crime augments the atrocity.[9]

At bottom this crime of regicide has been the result of the attack of the Goddess Reason against Christianity, directed against the walls of the citadel of Christian civilization. It calls upon the clergy of France to exercise a grand mission: the working of a moral revolution in Europe, in the light of which even the excesses of the existing revolution would seem less an evil than they appeared. A situation in which human souls have lost the tension of vigorous life can perhaps not be cured without bloodshed. Humanity may be considered "as a tree which an invisible hand trims without flinching, and which gains often by the pruning."

> We are spoiled by that modern philosophy which declares that *every-*

---

[9] *Considerations sur La France,* chap. ii.

> *thing is good,* whereas evil has soiled everything, and in a sense *everything is evil,* because nothing is in its place. . . . *The whole creation groans* and strains, with pain and effort, toward another order of things.[10]

This new order of things is to be a moral regeneration, and a return of Christians to institutional unity. As to political institutions, it is to be a restitution; a reinstatement of divinely ordained monarchy. "Nature and history unite in establishing the fact that an indivisible republic of broad extent is an impossibility." A republic of large extent has never existed. With a so-called *representative government,* granting that under such government a people may be *free,* the people are not and cannot be sovereign. Sovereignty in France, under whatever constitution, will be exercised by a few in Paris, and the people will remain more truly subjects than under a monarchy.

The French Revolution has a character satanic, pretending to a purpose to support no religious cult. All imaginable political institutions which may hope to endure repose ultimately upon a religious idea. "Whether one laugh at religious ideas or venerate them, is of no importance: they form nevertheless, true or false, the sole basis of all durable institutions." [11]

He passes to consider in a very interesting chapter "The Divine Influence in Political Constitutions," in which observations of deep truth, with premises far less tenable, mingle. The rights of peoples are never written, save in the sense that they declare rights which have previously existed. In the formation of constitutions divine guidance brings it about that circumstances mold affairs, and men are but among these circumstances. In the course of pursuing one intended goal, another and different one is achieved. Laws are but the declaration of rights, and these rights are not declared until they are menaced. Hence a multiplicity of laws prove only a multiplicity of attacks against habitual rights, and presage their destruction. No nation can give itself liberty which has not already that liberty. Legislators but assemble and codify existing customs, and since states were in the first instance constituted by kings, liberty has always been, in a sense, the gift of kings. The rights of man go back to his creation; so politics and religion melt together, and one distinguishes with difficulty legislators from priests. No assembly of men can constitute a nation, and no nation can achieve by the instrumentality of written laws any rights whatsoever which do not already exist in its natural constitution.

---

[10] Chap. iii. Italics in text.

[11] Chap. v.

We cannot stop to analyze this brief summary as a piece of political philosophy, save that it palpably confuses two quite different principles: one that laws can do no more than aim to secure existent liberty, and another, the assumption that there is a certain static natural law inherent in the traditions of a people, of ultimate divine source, decreed at times by the voice of divinely appointed kings. What interests us rather here is the fact that, against the too naïve belief of that period in the ability to decree liberty overnight, by the simple expedient of formulating or revising constitutions, there were those who, while realizing that a liberty the sole basis of which was some written law, might as easily disappear before some other written law; on the other hand were unable to envisage political security and stability in other form than that of sacrosanct royalty, insuring for subjects the preservation of certain natural rights which had been theirs, since such time that the memory of no man runneth to the contrary. Such men assumed as divinely based the eternal security of traditions already shaken in authority, where not repudiated. As political philosophers they merely guessed wrong, while others not less doctrinaire pushed in the direction of the running current.

But, as apologists for Christianity they did something of more far-reaching importance. They placed Europe's religion of centuries in a position of an obstacle to the spread of human justice and liberty. They helped to make organized Christianity, more particularly in its Roman Catholic form, the bulwark of monarchies which, clearly upon the defense against the desires and ambitions of their subjects, could no longer serve as bulwarks of peace and social happiness, since for their self-preservation they were forced to resist, and thus become tyrannical.

The alliance of organized Christianity and the program of political reaction which followed the Congress of Vienna weakened gradually and steadily, its final blow coming when, the papacy stripped of its temporal power, Italy found as its allies in support of the establishment of the nation's capital in Rome, where the Pope no longer ruled, not Germany only, but Austria; Austria, the very seat and center of that alliance of 1815 which aimed to join Christianity and the reactionary European monarchs, in erecting a futile dyke against a movement aiming to adjust European institutions to new human attitudes, new political conceptions, and new economic interests.

No period probably in all European history ever did more to alienate from Christianity the sympathy of the hopeful and aspiring. Even in such overwhelmingly Catholic countries as Italy and France, Church and State were soon pitted against each other, and the attitude of all liberal and radical thought and thinkers began to be fixed to the effect that Christianity was the enemy of human freedom. Impulses toward social reform became increasingly hostile to religion.

On one hand the nineteenth century, during its former half at least, still tended to keep its back turned upon the eighteenth, as a skeptical and faithless century. The impulse which gave popularity to the apology of Chateaubriand was there. The human heart was awake, aspiration ran strong. On the other hand the daily preoccupations of the mass became more and more prosaic. Life was losing much of its older graciousness and picturesqueness. People had less faith in broad doctrinaire programs, and becoming more and more engrossed in their material interests looked about for salvation for their emotional natures. The religious reaction prefigured in Chateaubriand's treatise on the *beauties* of Christianity arrived, but not as a religious movement precisely. We are wiser to look for it rather in the so-called *romantic movement* in literature and art.

Of this movement we need say but little here. As has been said, it was not in itself religious, yet there was little or nothing with which religion is fundamentally interested to which it did not give expression through many personalities. Moreover, the movement did not on the whole disturb religion in any alarming manner, and contributed to religious thought directly in several conspicuous ways. The fact that it was not disturbing to religion is perhaps of great significance for religion in that period when the romantic movement flourished. In no preceding century for perhaps a thousand years could a movement have so affected the sentiment and orientation of so many Europeans, while leaving religion so little altered. Now, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, such a movement was able to embrace Catholics, Protestants of various shades, theists, atheists.

The explanation of this fact lies in the character of the movement, and in the now dominant interests of the society which accepted it in such a catholic manner. Before the end of the second decade of the century a general increase in wealth and the amplitute of provision for life might be generally noted. This was attributed to the new régime, and the battle of reactionary diplomats to reëstablish the old order was lost. The enthusiasm for constitutional monarchs spread. In England an elderly prime minister (Melbourne) in almost daily lessons instructed a very young constitutional monarch (Victoria) as to how a proper constitutional monarch should act. In France, for a time at least, it seemed satisfying to have a monarch who "wore a round hat and carried an umbrella, occupied the least possible amount of space, satisfied himself with the most modest titles," and might be openly caricatured on billboards. The greater political powers of Europe, with various degrees of willingness, decided that Belgium might separate from Holland and institute a constitutional monarchy of her own, and then after much negotiation decided whom Belgium should be allowed to choose as ruler. Liberty was still in the air; also underground and rumbling.

But Liberty was no longer a vigorous maiden with a cap upon her flowing hair, striding toward a rainbow, a sword raised in one hand, a banner floating from the staff held by the other. Liberty was a more prudent matron with a house and garden of her own to be conserved. Indeed she might be likened to an anxious and fluttering mother bird, her fledglings beside her on a branch, facing the inevitable moment when they must learn to fly, and not knowing exactly what might happen to them when they tried. And yet not quite a mother bird either, since those who looked on uneasily were moved by no fond maternal instinct, but often by nothing warmer than fear and suspicion. And it was not only that in revolution there was seen to lurk grave dangers to the security of accumulating property interests. Even from uneasiness these property interests suffered. For the first time political physicians felt the pulse of social fears in quotations as to the sales value of British consuls and French *rentes*. On paper at least people's fortunes might be depleted by a single political speech.

So many of these things have become commonplaces to us that it is difficult for us to measure their importance then. The past was still alive: the immediate past of military glory and of republican enthusiasm, the more distant past, in which there had always been room for the gracious, the picturesque, even the quixotic, to act out its imaginings freely, with no conscious effect at least upon anyone's material interests. Every extravagant gesture seemed for the moment perilous. Politicians watched the religious pulse of the lower classes particularly. The French had it in for the Roman Catholic Church above all, the Bavarian Minister in Paris wrote to his royal master in 1830.[12] England has a resource lacking in France, more religion and decency of habit among the lower classes,[13] the Austrian Ambassador wrote home from London the same year.

> Kennst du das Land wo die Citronen blühn?
> —Dahin, dahin möcht' ich mit dir.[14]

The land where the citrons bloomed, where palaces rose upon marble pillars beside a peaceful sea—there was the place that warm imaginative dreams might be most safely dreamed. Thither drifted those melting melodies of Chopin. There were the Greek villages in perpetual festival upon which Keats brooded, contemplating a Greek painted vase. There were the knights and castles of Scott's romances. There, from a sky perpetually blue, the sky-lark poured forth a joyous pæan from "heaven or somewhere near it," while Shelley listened.

---

[12] Quoted by de Guichen, *La Revolution de 1830 et l'Europe,* Introd.
[13] *Ibid.,* 2.
[14] Goethe, *Wilhelm Meister's Wanderyahre.*

Here was certainly a way of salvation. It fed upon religion, and religion fed upon it. It did two things at once: rendered visions of richer existence socially harmless, and furnished a way of escape from the growing humdrum of economic routine preoccupation. The romantic movement was one of the great creative periods of the poetic imagination, beside which we can perhaps only place the fifty century B.C. in Greece, the Augustan Age in Rome, and the Renaissance at the beginning of what we call the Modern Age in Europe. The social influence of the movement was great. Poetry might be written, and widely read, at any length, and upon a large variety of subjects. But its relation to the society in which it was born is unique among these four movements. It was emancipation of a very particular sort. It far less presaged in idealized form what was coming to be, or represented in poetized generalization what was, than carried off into a world of make-believe those enthusiasms which a half-century earlier had seemed realizable.

Consequently it was an "artistic movement" in a new sense. It could not attach itself, as art had often done through periods when it was not closely in content with the social mass, to some leisure world relatively free to mold itself, at least in a measure, to an ideal which the art it patronized expressed. This the Augustan poetry of Rome had found, and the troubadour poets, conspicuously. But this movement was obliged to create its own world, Bohemia, and to announce its emancipation from the general social world in various ways—in the clothes that artists wore, the length to which they did or did not let their hair grow. It was, in one sense at least, a sort of nineteenth-century monasticism, framed, however, more after the manner of the Abbaye Thélème of Rabelais than traditional medieval cloisters, in which a new priesthood, and a larger mass vicariously through them, might innocuously snub routine and convention. In this way a portion of the effervescence which had previously at times vented itself, in what claimed to be the more serious life-and-death matter of religion, was drawn off into a dream-world where no one, save perhaps some of the artists themselves, ever imagined that anything seriously mattered. One might now be religious in two different ways; in one with the assistance of these romantics, in another way in church, and each way helped to make the other easier.

But the artists themselves, certainly some of them, were seriously trying to get from somewhere to somewhere else, and the most broadly significant poem of this period is certainly religious, in this at least, that it is upon its very face a quest for salvation—a quest, moreover, which takes us over from one atmosphere into the aspiration which was to lie beneath that to follow.

The poem in question is Goethe's great drama, *Faust.* Goethe's *Faust,* despite the fact that its author's subject, erudition, and the atmosphere of "court" he rarely could shake off completely, sometimes almost fool you into thinking it of the Renaissance, begins decidedly in the troubled atmosphere of what the Germans call the *Aufklärung.*

The drama begins with a mood of skeptical desperation, in which the predominant element is intellectual:

> Habe nun, ach! Philosophie,
> Juristerei und Medicin,
> Und leider auch Theologie
> Durchaus studiert, mit heissem Bemühn.
> Da steh' ich nun, ich armer Thor!
> Und bin so klug als wie zuvor.[15]

Against this hopeless ignorance magic is tried, and it promises nothing. The Easter hymn brings religious habit uppermost.

> Die Botschaft hör' ich wohl, allein mir fehlt der Glaube.[16]

Despite lack of conviction, there is something in the chanted "Christ is arisen" sufficient to arrest the impulse to suicide. So much for the *Aufklärung.* Then, under compact with Mephistopheles, comes the romantic search for satisfying adventure, and under the most favorable circumstances, it might seem, since with the assistance of his satanic friend, the laws of nature and of men may be circumvented.

---

[15] "Long now I've studied philosophy, medical science and legal lore, even alas theology, from A to Zed with eager toil; here still I stick, a fool, no more, not one whit wiser than before."

[16] "The invitation I hear well enough; faith alone is the thing I lack."

And what is to be the end of this romantic quest? A single completely satisfactory moment:

Werd' ich zum Augenblicke sagen:
Verweile doch! du bist so schön!
Dann magst du mich in Feseln schlagen,
Dann will ich gern zu Grunde gehn!
Dann mag die Todtenglocke schallen,
Dann bist du deines Dienstes frei,
Die Uhr mag stehn, der Zeiger fallen,
Es sei die Zeit für mich vorbei.[17]

So much for the sort of salvation which the romantic quest was supposed to proffer; what then for the *dénouement?*

Death had once been cheated by the Easter hymn. Now after a long, laborious, and what Goethe's genius by no means always saves from being a boring quest, Mephisto is, in a sense, cheated of his prey: by a dream—a dream of swampland reclaimed, made healthy, inhabited by busy, happy people, daily earning a comforting pittance by honest toil. It is not even required of Faust that he carry out this hopeful project. The wish to see things so is itself his salvation. Angels carry him to heaven, chanting—

Alles Vergängliche
Ist nur ein Gleichniss;
Das Unzulängliche
Hier wird's Ereigniss;
Das Unbescreibliche
Hier ist's gethan;
Das Ewig-Weibliche
Zieht uns hinan.[18]

Who then may say that the romantic movement had not done a stroke for religion in the nineteenth century?

---

[17] "Should I ever come to say to some moment: Linger, you are so fair! then you may bind me with your chains, then will I gladly leave the earth, then may the death-gong strike, then are you freed from your pact of service; the clock may stop, the pointer fall, and Time for me be past and gone."

[18] "All the transitory is an image only; the insufficient here becomes accomplishment; the indescribable here is achieved; the Eternal-Feminine draws us upward."

# LXII

THE political career of Christianity, as a buttress of the program which followed the Congress of Vienna, was doomed to be a failure. The divinity of rulers it fostered was largely dynastic rather than national, and the very parceling of Europe which this Congress attempted merely emphasized this fact. Worst of all, pragmatically speaking, it was reactionary. Dynasties had arisen before nationalities, out of feudal medievalism. About some of these dynasties national sentiment and nations had drawn together. Imperceptibly the *divinity* had in reality shifted from dynasty to nation; monarchs, save as symbols of some national unity supported by the sentiment of peoples who had learned to think of themselves as sovereign nations, were anachronisms, which an attempt to parcel populations by diplomatic arrangement among princes and their ministers only made more apparent.

The political career of Christianity was, however, far from terminated. An important chapter still lay before, which we can hardly attempt to trace even in briefest outline. While the rapid course of tremendous events between 1789 and 1815 left the larger part of Europe timid and bewildered, the brutality of Bonaparte and the vacillation of the Prussian monarch Frederick Wilhelm III aroused in Germany a patriotic reaction, which began as early as 1808, with a *League of Virtue* (or valor—*Tugendbund*) purposed to set aside particularistic interests and work for the future of Prussia. Dissolved the next year this society continued to work underground until, with the defeat of Napoleon at Leipzig, its ardor spread generally through an entire population, to form the center of a growing passionate desire for German unity under Prussian leadership which, midst all its cross currents and disappointments, took on a more and more religious character.

This movement, stretching from 1813 to 1871, both found and bred religious sects, parties, quarrels, and dissensions. It crushed, in outward manifestation and effective influence a large part of those liberal and radical aspirations so active in the middle years of the nineteenth century. Here, however, the repression touched less the trunk of the tree than it pruned the branches. As the whole movement rested deeper than anything else upon a desire for German unity, and as it fed rather generously during the third quarter of this century upon military achievements flattering to national pride, revolutionary rumblings, so generally prevalent from 1830 to 1848, once vigorously handled, were soon all but forgotten.

But, behind all the troubled political currents of this complicated strand of European history, a religious revolution was effected, the roots of which rested in just those thought currents which had proven most troubling to religion elsewhere. While elsewhere Christianity seemed only to fight upon the side of those who wished to see political institutions remain fundamentally unchanged, this new religion presented Christianity as changing constantly, and reinstated the old divinity of kings in a new context, which in reality made the imperial monarch but the august symbol of that divine entity in which the will of a people was presumed to become one and indivisible: the State. We must turn back to the eighteenth century to trace the progress of this aspiring religious revolution.

Such an apology as that of Chateaubriand, though serving broadly in a moment of emotional reaction, did not touch the deeper issues which had kept the reflective and reasoning powers of men busy with problems grouped about traditional religion. It suggested disillusion with respect to reason, but such comfort as it brought left reason nothing to do in the matter. Moreover, even were one to destroy any of the glamour which had kept reasoned concepts fixed and reliable, this should be done reasonably and precisely.

The task of defining the true and proper authority and subject matter of rational inquiry had begun long before the nineteenth century, and these early steps must be briefly retraced, that we may see how philosophy was obliged to destroy a considerable portion of the complacency of the Age of Reason before it took up the task of defining reason's function in matters interesting to religion.

We have already quoted a consoling passage from Locke, who passed on his conclusions as one of the strongholds of the Age of Reason. But Locke's words contained, after all, a number of admonitions to caution. Having called attention to the modest usefulness of the understanding, kept within its proper sphere, he had gone on to explain that there were no *innate ideas.* That is to say, men did not rise to orderly and intelligent comprehension of their experience by applying to it certain patterns, which were born with and in the mind itself. Instead men were born with minds as bare and blank as a new sheet of writing paper. Impressions were then collected, inscribed as it were upon this blank sheet, grouped by noting resemblances, of one sort or another, in sensations otherwise different, thus forming general conceptions for later reference. One might note that dogs, cats, horses, and mice all possessed four motor appliances used with sufficient similarity of purpose to class these animals under a general term, quadrupeds—a *general idea,* if you will, but at bottom merely a statement that all alike possessed four feet.

Save the definite denial of the existence of innate ideas of whatever sort there was nothing particularly disturbing in this. Innate ideas had to be sure been useful to Descartes, to prove the existence of God from the existence of the *idea* of God. This did not seem to matter, since for Locke the existence of God was assumed involved in the fact that experience discovered different sorts of qualities in things.

Of these qualities two are trustworthy in a sense that none of the others are, *extension* and *impenetrability.* By reason of these qualities, which differentiates objects as to shape and individuality in space, objects are distinguished, both from one another and from the person who senses them. They together guarantee the fact that an external world exists, hence presumably God, as author of its existence, architect of the order discovered in the interrelated motions of these objects, stripped until they may be likened to so many colorless counters occupying definite portions of space. But the mind creates an order, represented in last analysis by the science of mathematics. The mind is not the creator, but the ordered mental creation dependent for its content upon bodily sensations. The creator in this case is the *soul,* distinct from sensation, antedating it, separable from it, separable from the body, thence presumably capable of outlasting the body, thence intrinsically immortal. We may at this point turn our attention for an instant to Robespierre during the Revolution, decreeing with his associates acceptance of the existence of God and the immortality of the soul.

These *primary qualities* of objects, extension and impenetrability, were of great importance to Locke, because of his conclusion that all other qualities possessed by objects were "in truth . . . nothing in the objects themselves, but powers to produce certain effects in us," from which effects we derive ideas as to "colors, sounds, tastes, etc."[1] So, but for the primary qualities, the amusement of the mind would be that of arranging sensations in an order which, for some reason hidden in the manner of its working, the mind liked to see them arranged in, the external universe becoming nothing more nor less than an orderly mental dream.

But, in the eighteenth century, two men, both in a measure hoping to do something for religion,[2] were to try their hand at destroying just this comforting distinction between primary and secondary qualities. We cannot follow their arguments. The older of them (George Berkeley, born 1685) traced abstract ideas "to the source from which they flow, which appears to be language."[3]

> It is indeed an opinion strangely prevailing amongst men, that houses, mountains, rivers, in a word all sensible objects, have an existence, natural or real, distinct from their being perceived by the under-

---

[1] Locke, *Of Human Understanding,* book ii, chap. viii.

[2] "But that a man who has written something with a design to promote useful knowledge and religion. . . ." (Dedication of Berkeley's *Principles of Human Knowledge*). "And these improvements are the more to be hoped for in natural religion. . . ." Introd. to Hume's *Treatise on Human Nature.*

[3] *Principles of Human Knowledge*, Introd.

> standing. . . . For what are the forementioned objects but the things we perceive by sense? And what do we perceive by sense besides our own ideas and sensations? [4] . . .
>
> If there were external objects, it is impossible that we should ever come to know it; and if there were not, we might have the very same reasons to think there were that we now have.[5]

What, we may properly ask since Berkeley came to be a bishop, has all this to do in aid of religion? It proves, or is expected to prove, that nothing exists save a Supreme Spirit and subordinate spirits, and that the Supreme Spirit "excites" ideas in our minds—more usually orderly ideas which may be arranged as a universe, but occasionally, since we are so constituted as to look upon inconsistency and mutability as signs of freedom, he interrupts this order with miracles, to prove to us that he is a free spirit,[6] all in order to convince us that we, as spirits, and that this Supreme Spirit, exist.

Berkeley was born in Ireland, in the County of Kilkenny, and had a mind fertile of discovery in the speculative field of mathematics. With such a combination almost anything might happen in the spirit world. His fellow iconoclast, born a quarter of a century later, was a Scotchman, and likewise a deist, as confirmed on the whole as Bolingbroke himself.

This fact, however, did not save David Hume from cutting from underneath his own feet the very basis upon which the deists' position was established, by concluding that the whole content of the mind, ordered or disordered, was but sensation and reflection upon sensation. Moreover, that the whole idea of cause and effect, with which the devotees of natural religion were wont to reason from the orderly progression of events in the universe to some divine supermechanician, was in itself but reflection upon sensation. We note, in repeated sensations, that certain sensations habitually appear in couples, of which one invariably precedes the other, and not vice versa. We conclude that one cannot appear without the trailing twin, and thence our conclusion that the first *causes* the second. The distinction between primary and secondary qualities also disappeared before his analysis, and with it certainty as to the existence of an external universe. Indeed the conclusion was so disconcerting that he preferred to rest in an inconsistent faith, arguing that natural religion was an almost inevitable consequence of the mind's discovery in the conception of God the simplest explanation of that orderly arrangement of cause and effect in the world we perceive.

---

[4] *Ibid.,* Part I, par. 4.

[5] *Ibid.,* Part I, par. 20.

[6] *Ibid.,* Part I, par. 57.

From the standpoint of its intellectual basis (and this intellectual basis had now become the important field of religious strife, since European peoples were no longer ready to go to war for the sake of one brand of religion rather than another, though they might unite to support religion in the interest of social and political stability whatever its brand) religion was now in a mess. Hardly anyone perceived this mess more clearly than Hume himself. Contemplating the works of nature men could not "entertain any conception but one of a single being, who bestowed existence and order on this vast machine, and adjusted all its parts, according to one regular plan and connected system." But, tracing the footsteps of this invisible power among the "various and contrary currents of human life," one was led toward polytheism, toward a belief in "several limited and imperfect deities."[7] With the religious problem shifted from that of saving individual souls to that of saving collected societies this was a troubling conclusion. According to the budding science of political economy men were soon to learn that, so long as the social order was preserved, people prospered according to their deserts, to such extent that God might, if one considered the matter religiously, be expected to reward in eternity those particularly who most flourished in orderly society. A religion which provided order among the courses of the stars, but left the presumption of several gods but relatively potent, and perhaps incompatible in purpose, when one turned to regard their social efficacy, was no guarantee at all that trade might progress in the way of prosperity under orderly social and political conditions.

---

[7] Hume, *The Natural History of Religion,* sec. ii.

In short, the natural religion of eighteenth-century brand was rapidly approaching the point where it had outlived its usefulness, and it was just at the end of the eighteenth century that a German, of partially Scottish ancestry, was to conclude thoroughly the investigation in a sense begun by Mr. Locke, and developed disconcertingly in two different directions by Bishop Berkeley and David Hume.

This man was Immanuel Kant, the son of a poor saddler of Königsburg on the Baltic. In the matter of religion two very determinedly pious, but quite different currents touched in him. One was the stern Calvinist morality, which may have crossed from Scotland not long after the age of John Knox himself. The other was the German Pietist movement, which began in the seventeenth century, and gained inspiration, among other places, from the writing of Jacob Boehme. The Pietists awaited, many of them, the immediate coming of the final Kingdom predicted in the Apocalypse. The spirit of prophecy was kept alive among them, and also something which may be called the camp-meeting spirit. On the whole the movement "stunted itself in anxiety and fear of action, knowing of life nothing but the still bedchamber"; but it appears to have had much better exemplification than this in the household of the simple saddler. He himself later said, speaking of his parents, "Even if the religious views of that day, and the notions of what was called virtue and piety, were not clear and satisfactory, nevertheless the thing itself was found."[9]

But we cannot linger upon the subject of his life or activities, save perhaps to note that, while the external habits of life remained with him always of a contracted regularity and simplicity hardly differing from that probably of his parents, and at times ridiculous in its devotion to its regular routine, his mind little by little, not only traveled everywhere throughout the world,[10] but emancipated itself, about as nearly as such a posi-

---

[8] Hettner, *Literaturgeschichte des XVIIIten Yahrhunderts,* III, 1, 61.

[9] Stuckenberg, *Life of Immanuel Kant,* 9.

[10] He gave for many years popular lectures on physical geography (though he had never crossed the boundaries of the province in which he was born), and his memory was so accurate that when he described things of which he had read, people were convinced that he had not only seen but lived among them.

tive mind could, from dogmatism, prejudice and fanaticism, all of which, certainly in theory, he detested heartily.

When, in middle life, Kant began to read Hume, and to occupy himself with Hume's problem, things began to happen, for here was perhaps the keenest analytical mind which European civilization had turned up since Aristotle. He concluded that what he called "the physiology of human understanding" of the type begun by Locke, only led thought back again to "worm-eaten dogmatism" from which science had been attempting to draw it;[11] and slowly and painstakingly he began to draw together a *Critique of Pure Reason.*

We are interested here only in his conclusions, in so far as they affected religion, nor can we indeed stop for all his conclusions on this subject. Two things above all, in religion, interested people: whether God could be proven to exist, and that the validity of the moral law should rest upon stable grounds.

As to the first question he was rather unsettling. So far as the order of nature was concerned, as proving the existence of God, that would hardly do; since what mind calls an *order of nature* is an order which mind constructs in nature, afterwards postulating the existence of God to account for an order which the mind itself has created. This postulate is very convenient for the mind, and also for other parts of humanity's being; but one cannot comfortably jump from the fact that the mind would like the assurance of such a being's existence to the different sort of fact that the being exists. Indeed, by his analysis, he discovers several apparently inherent contradictions which arise in pushing the action of the mind, governed by logic, to ultimate conclusions. Religion has an interest in all of these contradictions (of which he says there are four). You can argue, with logical consistency, that the universe must have been created, or that it never could have been created. Both of these arguments cannot, in every sense, be true. You can argue with equal logical consistency that everything which is, is essentially *one,* linked to everything else, or that everything which is, is essentially *by itself* and *alone.* Again, both of these arguments cannot be in every sense true. You again, with the same consistency, can uphold a belief that freedom of action must somewhere exist in the universal machinery, or the belief that everything must take place according to absolutely determined unchanging law. Finally, you can argue that there must be one *necessary* being, either belonging to or the cause of the world; or that there can be no such thing as a necessary being anywhere, either in the universe, or cause of it.

---

[11] *Kritik der reine Vernunft,* 1st ed., Preface.

So far, it might seem that one could be, with equal surety, either an atheist or a theist of some sort. It seemed to be largely a matter of choice. There was, however, little doubt as to where Kant's own personal choice lay. Two things, he said, struck him dumb: "The starry firmament, and the sense of right and wrong in man." His mother, when he was a lad, had walked with him, had directed his eyes toward the heavens and the stars, teaching him to see behind them the vast order of God. Newton, whom he had read and digested with great enthusiasm, had done likewise. So later, in another treatise, he found, in the realm of feeling, a proof of God's existence. And the sense of right and wrong also helped him to solve the insoluble dilemma of intelligence as to the existence of God. He felt that men must be moral, and that to be moral they must have freedom of action in their own wills. But, in order to be both moral and free, there must be absolute commandments, unchangeable and everywhere valid categories of right and wrong (a *categorical imperative,* he called this principle), and since reason, which could not get outside itself to anything absolute, might not legislate with this absoluteness, there must be a God, if for nothing else, so that there might be a foundation for this categorical imperative.

There was, and here we come back again to that prophetic remark of Hume, about the disorder of human action as compared with the order of natural phenomena, a portion of society of growing influence content on the whole to find nothing left of God but a categorical imperative, which they might judiciously administer. It seemed to turn over to the policeman the troublesome matter of enforcing types of conduct still believed by almost everybody to be based upon revealed commandments, eliminating all questions such as had previously not seldom occasioned wars for the purpose of deciding what sort of religion, and what sort of moral emphasis, should be socially enforced, and concentrating upon a few prohibitions of undoubted value in protecting private property and everybody's personal right to mind his own business to the full extent of his capacity to make this attention lucrative.

For circumstances had conspired with Kant in proving that accepting by decree the existence of God and the immortality of the soul neither insured social order and security, nor did it give any comforting sense of internal security or salvation in moments of social disorder. Instead these events had rather suggested that in moments of stress people indulged in wild gestures of despair, supinely waited in stunned passivity, or fled to superstitions. These reactions appeared in Germany itself in the troubled period previous to 1848. The reign of Frederick the Great, himself more skeptical in religion than his friend Voltaire, who was occasionally scandalized by the former's railing infidelity, introduced in Germany the theories of the deists. In an atmosphere influenced by the fact that the monarch cared nothing as to the religious beliefs of his subjects, so long as they remained obedient as subjects, it penetrated even into the realm or revealed doctrine, breeding rationalistic and sentimental mysticisms of many sorts. Goethe carried on a mystic amour with Fräulein von Kettenberg, flirted intellectually with illuminati and alchemistic lore. In the troubled atmosphere of the early nineteenth century religious affairs were not less disordered. While hardy souls preached the *Aufklärung* an even larger number refuged in little groups and sects practicing petty superstitions, and indulging in vapid fetishisms. Such matters could not be taken with the light-heartedness of the French. Antireligion must become a religious crusade against religion; mysticism could remain no boudoir diversion, but must grow into an illuminated explanation of the inner secret of the universe entire. Goethe has Faust, at the beginning of his drama, summon by incantation the *Weltgeist,* that he may learn from this spirit the inner secret of the universe. When this spirit who weaves the "external garment of the Godhead" appears, Faust explains how near he feels to him, to be met by the rebuke:

> Du gleichst der Geist die du verstehst,
> Nicht mir.

Here the *Weltgeist* speaks in a sense the language of Kant, and disappears to leave Faust to reach in despair for the poison bottle. Despair is in a measure poison to the German spirit. Between a rampant search for materialistic satisfaction or sensual diversion and a crusade after some big idea which embraces in aspiration more or less the universe entire there seems seldom to have been any middle way for the Germans. The rapidly increasing possibilities for material satisfaction during the last century of the Middle Ages seems to have worked more extravagances and social dislocations in Germany than anywhere else, and upon proportionate fervor in the opposite direction the Lutheran Reformation fed, to burst in repercussion all orderly bounds in the horrors of the Thirty Years' War.

And so, as the national spirit began to grow in Germany, toward those gropings which ended in an empire declared in a captured city at the end of a spectacular war, it enwrapped itself in metaphysical speculation of strong religious coloring, which set out from where Kent's criticism in its clear development left off, on the one hand positively framing a religious absolute to feed the aspiration of this new vigorous nation, on the other hand, working disturbing revolution in the world of Protestant theology.

Let us then turn, in another chapter, to review this new philosophy of religious coloring, first as it fitted into the German political situation. Here it soon manifested a practical efficacy, which it will afford some satisfaction to note before passing to see it turned loose as a disturbing religious solvent elsewhere in Europe.

## LXIII

GERMANS had been given, in the social vision of Martin Luther, the plan of a social structure of religious basis in which neither medieval feudalism nor a church of the medieval pattern were necessarily involved. Moreover they had been given, as a result of the particular character of the religious experience of the same Martin Luther, a conception of the motivation of religious faith in which even inspired Scriptures were less intrinsically involved than appeared to Luther himself.

His ideal of the Christian state, as we have seen, was an aggregate of Christians, each and everyone with the righteousness which is of faith in the spiritual center of his being, and each with his various and separate function, these Christians being, for worship and religious instruction, organized as a church; for law, order, the administration of justice, for benevolence, and for education, organized as a state. Such was the organic conception. But this organic conception, as we have also seen, had a history, and a history very personal to Luther. At the very center of this personal history there was a book, or a collection of writings, the Bible. On the basis of passages in this book, something in himself which had formerly been the cause of terror-breeding doubts and horror-stricken suffering had suddenly become an assurance of salvation. Let us try, as a rough analogy to such a situation, as it existed prior and subsequent to his conversion, to imagine a person who had no previous experience of hunger and the natural appeasement of this suffering by eating. Such a person, let us say, has not eaten and suffers the pangs of hunger, without any instinctive knowledge as to what this suffering means. He imagines that the pain he experiences is a symptom of some malady from which he is about to die. He becomes tortured and consumed by fear that he is about to die. Then suddenly someone assures him that this suffering is not given him as a sign of impending death, but as an incentive to eat and live. He experiments with the suggestion, and discovers that eating not only cures the pain, but that it is a pleasurable sensation in itself. Such a man might subsequently attribute his *cure,* either to the fact that he had eaten, or to the fact that he had fortunately fallen upon someone who gave him the saving advice, or to both, with any variety of emphasis upon one or the other.

But let us further assume that, at the same time when one friend was urging him to eat, another was advising him to get his life insured; and that even after his cure this same second friend continued to insist that the cure was not real but illusory, since the only eternally valid cure was life insurance. The vociferous insistence of this second friend would very likely cause him to emphasize later the value of the advice and prescription to eat, even perhaps over and above the act of eating itself. It is no longer the question of disease and remedy, but the comparative validity of two authorities.

In other words, Luther's doctrine of salvation, or justification, by *grace* was born of the Bible, fed upon the Bible; but controversy with the contrary claims of the older religious institution to be the medium of salvation pushed the Bible into a position of being looked upon as a literally inspired book. Luther's doctrine of grace was not, like Calvin's doctrine of election, juridical. It did not require basically a law book. It required merely a book of reliable spiritual inspiration, a table set with wholesome food upon which the seed of grace sown in the heart might be nourished.

As we have seen, the eighteenth century did not, so far as the broadest mass of religious critics was concerned, attack religion root and branch. On the contrary the most prevalent types of intellectual structure required the assumptions, both of the existence of God and of an immaterial, or at least separable element in man, which it chose to call the soul. It also assumed the existence of stable moral principles, the pattern of which might be glimpsed in the orderly phenomena of nature, and the necessity for which lay in the fact that man was a social being, and must live with his fellows in an orderly way.

What the eighteenth century attacked, for far the largest part, were claims of divine revelation as the authoritative basis for doctrines which contravened eighteenth-century scientific conceptions, and the abuses, hypocrisies, and arrogant claims of religious institutions.

The eighteenth-century natural religion claimed to have a social function, was wont at least often to claim that its injunctions were an essential of social order and security. The fact remained, or at least seemed to many proven by the events of the late eighteenth century, that natural religion did not function socially in any constructive manner. In times of social stress people, on the contrary, were prone either to slip back into even the most questionable of old practices, or indulge in troublesome anarchic gestures. A shrewd politician such as Napoleon, and the not less shrewd politicians who ruled the Congress of Vienna, realized clearly enough that, while natural religion, or no religion at all, might do for them personally, the safest thing socially was to keep religious beliefs and practices of the traditional source alive among the mass.

Natural religion was weak in two places: it did not present a God who appeared to rule anything more closely connected with mankind than the orderly courses of the stars, since the deist looked to God largely to bolster up his science, still ruled largely by conceptions drawn from celestial mechanics. The moral authority of such a religion was, socially speaking, attenuate. Secondly, unless one were, like Kant, struck dumb by the starry firmament, after having sketched the limits of human thought, such a God was beyond the reach of ordinary emotional aspirings; it left the feelings rather cold.

It was just at these two points, with the deists' natural religion pointing in directions where the ordinary emotional and imaginative machinery was little likely to reach, that Kant left open a way back to religion. Kant found an authoritative basis for religion in the spontaneous reaction of satisfaction resulting from contemplation of the beautiful, in which he saw concretely symbolized that ideal of perfection, realized purpose, which as an intellectual formulation framed one of his rejected proofs of the existence of God. In the sphere of morals he found something more than an authoritative basis of religion—the unqualified necessity for religion, as basis for a moral law of unquestioned and unquestionable validity.

The eighteenth century, with its aftermath, left Europeans divided, religiously speaking, into three roughly separable classes. There were those who still accepted naïvely traditional doctrines and practices, or who held to and defended them as essential to the religion which they could not let go. There were those who, despite demolished faith in doctrine, felt the necessity of some religion, and thus searched a basis for one. Finally there were those who, their faith in traditional doctrine and practices demolished, rejected religion entirely.

The first class was by far the largest, the second class was in influence far more preponderate than its comparative number, the third class was by far the smallest, and as yet only as vociferous as it dared to be.

We need for the moment pay little attention to any but the second class. Deism had been framed for and by them, and had failed in both of the two subdivisions into which this class itself divided—those who aimed to save religion, despite dogmatic doubts and questionings, mainly and first of all for the warm feeling of hope, comfort and assurance it engendered in themselves personally; and those who aimed to save religion, first of all, as an hypothesis which certainly did no harm when kept in its proper place, and which might be expected to exercise a salutary influence in stabilizing society, by inculcating and sanctifying regular industrious habits which respected the rights of others, and types of conduct which made for law, order, peace, and the security of property.

Here was a long gamut of two polar emphases, one of which tended to approach religion from the standpoint of its relation to the emotional nature of man, the other from the standpoint of ethics. The essential was to find a basis for religion somewhere, such that traditional dogmas might be rendered immaterial and incapable of causing quarrelsome disputes. No one of political or social importance wished to disturb naïve faith anywhere, so long as it might rest innocuous as far as practical interests were concerned. Best of all religions would be one which warmed the heart with feelings until they liquefied in social content, or a religion which lent enthusiasm to types of moral conduct which allayed such rebellious mutterings as were all about. Best of all, for Germany at the moment, was a philosophy, or philosophies, of religion which could be made to serve the purposes of a rapidly developing, strong, vigorous, and ambitious nation.

> I desire, above everything else, to assure to my country that place which Providence has assigned it by an incomparable history, and by placing in the hands of Prussia the shield of security and of German right. . . . Nobles, burghers, peasants; all of you who are here assembled, all of you to whom reaches my voice, this is the question I address to you: Will you, with heart and soul, in words and actions, with the sacred fidelity of a German heart, the holier love of a Christian soul—will you assist me to maintain the Prussia which I have just described, in such manner that the duty which lies before this nation shall be realized, and not perish?

So spake the Prussian monarch to his assembled subjects in Berlin in 1840. The atmosphere was rife with philosophic systems. Philosophers spoke with political authority, and guided political movements with criticism and encouragement. One professor even went so far as to say that, among all the learned professions (scientists, theologians, jurists), the philosopher alone dared to raise his voice. This he said in a lecture upon the philosopher Fichte.

It was this same Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814) who had framed the absolute undogmatic religion of emphasis upon ethics to serve in this situation. He was a disciple of Kant, or believed himself to be, although the master repudiated the disciple when he showed himself disposed very positively to resolve in a single comprehensive assertion the contradictions Kant had discovered in analyzing intellectual activity. The fundamental preoccupation of Fichte's intellectual activity was that of reducing philosophy to a science, for which he believed it necessary only to discover "one single fundamental proposition or principle" to which all other propositions in the science are logically connected, "and unite with it to form a whole." [1]

This system, however, need hardly concern us here, and fortunately, since it would be difficult to discover one more troublesome and abstract. It is sufficient for us to note that Fichte found the fundamental principle he sought in what he called *an act,* or an *affair of action* (*Thathandlung*). I declare, or posit, "I am I"; then I proceed to declare, of everything whatsoever which does not as "I" fall within my first declaration, "This, that, or the other is *not-I.*" There then comes a third proposition which is laid down, somewhat as follows: "*I* and *not-I* each begins where the other leaves off, so that outside the categories *I* and *not-I* there is nothing which may in any sense be or exist." So the game of knowing begins, on the principle that it is a process of transferring from pigeonhole *not-I* to pigeonhole *I,* it being always understood that whatever remains *not-I* suffers, so long as it so remains, the stigma of being negative in a system which is all positive activity.

It would have been very dangerous in any social situation to leave such a positive declarative *I* loose and independent. That was by no means Fichte's intention, but we can only suggest this fact by suggesting that Fichte's philosophy of religion dealt with a community of saints knit together to constitute an ideal society by something which began as blind obedience to authority and ended in perfect knowledge—comprehending absorption in absolute creative mind.

A science of knowledge which begins with an affair of action has quite naturally a companion philosophy of religion of ethical emphasis, and also an ethics which has to do with the matter of *learning by doing.* And indeed, when ethics descended from the sphere of abstraction with Fichte, reënforced with mystic religious warmth, it became largely a *matter of learning,* in which, however, the game did not begin with the positing "I am I," but in the positing by absolute uncontroverted authority, as yet in pigeonhole *not-I,* of an absolute rule of action: "This thou shalt, or thou shalt not do, even though for the present you do not know the reason why."

---

[1] *Science of Knowledge* (Wissenschaftslehre), Introd.

> The activity of the pupil which is intended for the development of his spiritual cultivation, is without doubt an activity according to rules, which rules are a sort of anticipatory information, serving until such time as he shall have gained in his own experience insight into the fact that this is the sole possible way of acting. So this activity creates knowledge, and indeed universally valid laws without exceptions. Also, in the free development which arises from this point on, it has become impossible that anything should be undertaken which is contrary to these universal laws, and it is established that no action succeeds until the law has been obeyed. Such action is therefore in its final result a development of the pupil's powers of intelligence. . . . The pupil learns.[2]

These words were not spoken in university lectures, but in patriotic addresses to German citizenry. The pupil learns what? it might be asked. The pupil learns that he neither shall nor even can learn anything which contradicts any law which has been given him initially as an authoritative commandment. To patriotic citizens the task of making practical application of this theory is made easy. All that remains to be done is to provide the proper sort of authoritative teachers. The provision of teachers, by German tradition as old at least as Luther, was a function of the state. It might seem, as one coupled together various elements of Fichte's teaching, that the kingdom of God was about to be constituted, saintly life inaugurated,[3] by an attitude of warm and trusting obedience to the rising Prussian state.

It was Schleiermacher (Freidrich E. D. 1768-1834) who formulated for the early nineteenth century in Germany a philosophy of religion basing it upon feeling. He, too, had of course fallen upon Kant's works. But he had also lived through his life with the romantic movement, and in friendship with some of its leaders. Some of these romantic friends, however, had developed irregularities of action which as a theologian he might rather treat with sympathetic charity than approve. At all events, whatever the cause, Schleiermacher's religion of feeling was to be no unordered response either to the irregularities or beauties with which nature impressed romantic susceptibilities.

---

[2] *Reden an die deutsche Nation.*

[3] See Fichte's *Anweisung zur Seligen Leben.*

> Neither fear of the material forces which you see active on the earth, nor joy in the beauty of material nature should or can give you the first intuitive vision (*Anschauung*) of the world or of its spirit. Not in the thunder of the heavens, nor in the mighty billows of the sea shall you recognize the almighty being; not in the gay embroidery of flowers, not in the glory of the sunset glow loveliness and beneficence. It may be that both of these, fear and joyous pleasure, first lead in preparation the uncultivated sons of earth toward religion, but such feelings are not religion.

One cannot then, according to Schleiermacher, look to find God either in the order of nature, with the deist, nor in its forceful disorder and accidental beauty, as the romantics had often done. Where then must one look to find God as the assurance of religion? We must look to find this religious assurance in our feeling of absolute dependence upon the all-encompassing causality, viewed always in relation to our need for redemption. We must, in short, attain the comfort of salvation by setting our finitude in contrast to the infinity of the "living God" of whom nature is but an outer superficial garment, seeking, in the aspiration toward this infinite being, liberation from our finitude in a feeling of dependence.

Schleiermacher was soon accused of a "pantheism of feeling," but pantheism of feeling linked to an emotion of absolute dependence was not necessarily disturbing socially, and it was inevitable that it be interpreted in some terms less abstractly puzzling than those of metaphysics, as inherited from Kant. Indeed all that was needed was a convenient *absolute* of reference. All the various types of idealistic philosophy demanded such an absolute, since without one they left each individual floundering in a subjectivism which was just the ditch they all aimed to avoid. The Prussian state did not at all object to being thrust into the breach as this *absolute.* By the middle of the century the philosophy of Hegel seemed to suggest rather clearly that it occupied this position. At all events Schleiermacher's philosophy of religion, interpreted socially, attained a result somewhat as follows: Religion is a feeling of absolute dependence upon the existent social complex, from which dependence the individual is emancipated emotionally, by contemplating this immense social complex as in some way but that finite self of his, expanded to infinity.

So interpreted Schleiermacher furnished a philosophy of religion as effective for making good citizens as that of Fichte, and both of them were later commended in several paragraphs of praise by the most prominent historian apologist for the Pan-Germanism which was gradually to develop.[4]

Such philosophies of religion, to which historical doctrines and revealed writings were so significant only that they might either be rejected whole, piecemeal, or considered allegorically, never served elsewhere with the positive effectiveness which they for a time enjoyed in Germany. However, they did bring some comfort elsewhere to those who still held to their faith in religion, in spite of whatever they have felt to be shaky in its doctrines or institutions. Both Schleiermacher and Fichte might be used also, in a century attempting much of the time to still discontent with existing social conditions, by whoever found cause to be reasonably content with the existing social order, to make religion of assistance in persuading the less contented or fortunate to like it as well as they did, or to justify on religious grounds their own content.

But there was another possible basis of content for the humbler classes, more present, or at least to be hoped for more presently, than religion. Already, in 1820, that one of the pamphleteer-journalists of the Reformation period in France who comes perhaps nearer than any other to having attained a permanent representative rôle as such, wrote:

> The lower classes are wiser . . . much wiser, and much happier than before the Revolution; but, it must be admitted, they are less devout. . . . Here, I believe is the reason. The lower class (*le peuple*)

---

[4] Treitscke, *Geschichte Deutschlands im XIXten Yahrhundert.*

> has become the possessor of property. . . . It does not see anything but that, and dreams of no other thing. Its industry now liberated, and given over entirely to work, it forgets every other thing, religion included. . . . For the present or the future the peasant takes no account of anything farther off than a field, or a house which he possesses or hopes to possess. He has no other idea than this, and to wish him to have any other idea, or to talk to him of any other thing, is to lose one's time.[5]

With the rapid dissolution of political power which rested in the hands of an aristocracy whose income derived almost exclusively from the owners of land which others worked for them, it might have been a relatively simple matter to appease such appetites by dividing up agricultural land into small parcels under individual ownership, if everybody might have lived by cultivating the land. This couldn't be, of course, and the growth of the use of machinery made it less and less possible for the artisan to own his tools and workshop. It had more and more to be accepted by all but agricultural labor that, save for personal possessions he might use aside from working hours, all he could hope to own was his ability to labor. To realize the desire to gain from the sale of this labor as much social and material well-being as possible, the laborer did not turn to religion. He did not, as under the old régime, turn to some *patron,* or patrons whether as master-workman or customers. All the republican aspiration, all the agitation which had resulted in overturning the old régime based upon relations largely personal, taught him to turn here to the government under which he lived.

The government did not do for this class all they hoped. It is difficult to see how any government could have done even what they might have hoped at the beginning, to say nothing of the way in which such hopes are endless, every stage of fulfilled desire breeding new demands. But much philosophy as to the social responsibility of government for the less fortunate classes, and many Utopian schemes for bringing about increase in their material happiness were framed and scattered broadcast. The government of Louis Philippe, in France, did in fact attempt to put in operation some elements of such programs, and fell before a revolution in doing so, after failure and rapidly increasing attack in a growing radical press. The public press was a new element in politics, did not as yet derive its income from advertising, and the radical press was not more difficult to finance than that of any color with more powerful economic interests behind it. The press fell, to a large degree, into the hands, either of a ministry which supported it financially, or it was obliged to attract readers by sensational attacks against the ruling faction which bred disorder, upon which it throve.

---

[5] Paul-Louis Courier, *Petition à la Chambre des Députés pour les villageoises l'on empêche de danser.*

But the revolution as a result of which the government of Louis Philippe fell in 1848 became an element in the religious atmosphere of Europe, indirectly of considerable importance. Again a revolution in France shocked the political powers of all Europe, particularly since there followed close upon it revolutionary movements in many other European capitals: in Berlin, in Vienna, in Madrid, in Rome, to name the most important. The French settled their revolution for themselves, accepting overwhelmingly, after a short and by no means successful second experiment with a republic, the *coup d'état* in which a nephew of the great Napoleon declared himself emperor as Napoleon III. Elsewhere these movements were put down with a fist scarcely gloved, and the new French emperor introduced a régime which, while maintaining for a time some surface brilliance, did so with tyrannic methods, and with the assistance of some pale military adventures of doubtful value to the French or anyone else.

Previous to the Revolution of 1848 it may be said generally that movements for social reform by political means were not class conscious. Subsequent to this revolution they began to become more and more so.

Eighteenth-century attacks against religion, and the Church even, had been of interest mainly to those whose way was blocked by the property and prerogative interests of Church and nobles. The arguments used touched but few among the lower classes, who to an overwhelming majority rushed back to the bosom of the Church when the revolution was over. The Catholic Church lost none of its power to dispense what these people wanted of it as a result of whatever property it had lost in this struggle. Three revolutions and six governments, those of the French among the lower classes who were urged to contemplate the fact and others throughout Europe who looked on might conclude, had effected no progress which seemed satisfactory or even substantial in the matter of meeting the aspirations of the common people. The first of these revolutions had begun with a feeling, at least among the largest proportion of those who welcomed it, that God, whether in entirely orthodox garb or not, was on their side. The third left them, substantially all of them who cared to speculate upon the matter, or were won to do so by the leaders of the movement of social reform for the benefit of this class, with the suspicion that God was either socially ineffective, or he was against them.

Leaders were not lacking to persuade these less fortunate people that it was time to be done with a religion and a God who either could not or would not do anything for them.

> Why, tell me, these revolutions, with their deviations and reactions, their catastrophies and their crimes? . . . What is this order of *salvation* which has nothing in common with the order of the *present age;* this *spiritual* which annuls every other interest? . . . Either Catholicism is the allegory of society, or it is nothing. Either the time has come when the allegory should give way before the reality, or theology is impiety, and faith sacrilege.[6]

Against such attacks as this that apology for Christianity which made it a social asset, as assuring orderly conditions among men, was of no value whatsoever. Orderly was all very well; but whose order, and for whom?

Whether or not the challenge to Christianity thus offered was a valid one is hardly the question here. It is still to be proven that it is either possible or desirable to attempt to satisfy the material desires of everybody or anybody even. But it does rather forcibly suggest that an apologetic for Christianity which urged the value of religion as a support of the existing social order might come to prove rather a liability than an asset so far as holding the allegiance of the lower classes was concerned.

---

[6] Proudhon, P. J. (one of the socialist leaders of the Revolution of 1848), *Les Confessions d'un Revolutionnaire pôur servir à l'histoire de la Revolution de Fevrier,* chap. ii.

The Revolution of 1848, however, proved the last of nineteenth-century revolutions to trouble Europe generally, and wealth continued to increase. The problem of the poor, or relatively poor even, was not lost sight of. It troubled even many of the affluent in various ways. The history of philanthropy, organized or otherwise, in the latter half of the nineteenth century would be a long and complicated story of many well-intentioned attempts, and the discovery of innumerable practical difficulties, which somehow never seem to come nearer to unraveling. Such hope as arose is matter for a following chapter. But what if there were, save in a relative sense, no hope? Then, it might seem that if the poor could only have persisted in keeping alive enough confidence in a happier eternity, confidence in the benevolent intentions of their richer brethren, belief that there was, in Providence or individual deserts, some valid reason why some of their fellows were more economically fortunate than themselves; and if the opulent might never have been asked to give up of their own anything which they found essential to their comfort, or to the stability of their persons and fortunes, religion, assisted by the rapid growth of wealth and material well-being, might have not only continued to serve, but even to serve almost exclusively the poorer classes, as compensation for the many other desirable things they lacked.

So at least it seems as one reads much of the literature of the latter half of the nineteenth century. So it must seem when one reads a little poetic drama written shortly before the middle of the century by one who had become, at the century's close, perhaps that one English poet above all others whom people who thought themselves intellectual were supposed to read. Perhaps few poets have better deserved a higher place in any epoch than Robert Browning occupied in his, nor more completely earned from a complete change in the human atmosphere the distinction of being almost forgotten less than a half century later.

Browning was much interested in the religious movements and problems of his time, and the subject of religion, as it appeared to thoughtful people in the latter half of the nineteenth century, is often the subject of his poems. There is one poetic drama of his, the subject of which is more or less: religion in the life of one of the decidedly lower classes, and the comforting way in which it might affect members of decidedly more elevated classes. It is one of his poems which was a great favorite with many people who read Browning from fifty to even twenty-five or thirty years ago. To what extent it may be said to be typical of the influence of religion in the life of a pure mill worker of the time is a prodigious question; but the extent to which it represented what the better situated English-speaking person believed that the poor mill worker should get out of and do with religion, is a matter considerably less difficult to assess.

This dramatic poem, entitled *Pippa Passes*, first appeared in 1841. It is the story of a young mill worker's one holiday of the year, with which she can do anything she likes; what she did with it, and how her doing this affected several other people whom she believed to be much happier than herself. The holiday is New Year's Day, which must cast its memory of happiness over the whole year to follow.

> For, Day, my holiday, if thou ill-usest
> Me, who am only Pippa—old-year's sorrow,
> Cast off last night, will come again to-morrow:
> Whereas, if thou prove gentle, I shall borrow
> Sufficient strength of thee for new-year's sorrow.
> All other men and women that this earth
> Belong to, who all days alike possess,
> Make general plenty cure particular dearth,
> Get more joy one way, if another, less:
> Thou art my single day, God lends to leaven
> What were all earth else, with a feel of heaven—
>
> . . . . . .
>
> To-morrow I must be Pippa who winds silk,
> The whole year round, to earn just bread and milk:
> But this one day, I have leave to go,
> And play out my fancy's fullest games;
> I may fancy all day—and it shall be so—
> That I taste of the pleasures, am called by the names
> Of the Happiest Four in our Asolo.

And so she starts off upon her holiday, singing:

All service ranks the same with God:
If now, as formerly he trod
Paradise, his presence fills
Our earth, each only as God wills
Can work—God's puppets, best and worst,
Are we; there is no last nor first.

We cannot follow her through this day, as her song falls upon the ears, one after another, in some pregnant moment, of these four supposedly most happy people, to affect the current of their lives for good. The first episode will serve as well as any other. She visits, to gaze upon it from the outside only of course, the house of the owner of the mill in which she labors. Behind the closed shutters of this house hide the "happy" wife of the mill owner with her young lover—wife! widow we should rather say, since the lover has just murdered the husband. As these two are about to enjoy, in this new freedom, their love, Pippa passes, and she sings:

The year's at the spring
And day's at the morn;
Morning's at seven;
The hillside's dew-pearled;
The lark's on the wing;
The snail's on the thorn:
God's in his heaven—
All's right with the world.

Echoing Pippa's words, "God's in his heaven," the lover falls to cursing the mistress who had driven him to crime.

So the day passes, with three other changes upon this theme, and at night Pippa winds her way back to her little chamber, reflecting as she undresses:

. . . if I wind
Silk to-morrow, my silk may bind
And border Ottima's cloak's hem.
Ah me, and my important part with them
This morning's hymn, half promised when I rose!
True in some sense or other, I suppose.

. . . . . .

All service ranks the same with God—
With God, whose puppets, best and worst,
Are we; there is no last nor first.

It is a pretty story. There were many pretty stories written in those days. But it should not be forgotten that Pippa did not write the story, and doubtless very few Pippas ever read the story. Most of those who read it far more largely possessed the earth and its days than she, and to them it was doubtless a great comfort to reflect that after all, if there were people so apparently unfortunate as to possess but one free day in some three-hundred odd, God might so dispose it that this one day was quite as important and precious in the scheme of things as their more opulent holidays. If all service ranked the same with God, doubtless there was a sense in which poor Pippa was not a whit less well off than they, even though it were no part of their own wish, nor any more a part of God's great plan, that they should change places with her.

And they might reflect further, how very fortunate it was that Pippa recognized her place in the scheme of things, and might go to bed with the thought that her one holiday, now past and gone for a year, was ordained and given her by God, lent by him, "to leaven what were all earth else, with a feel of heaven."

This reflection should not be confused with an earlier attempt to "justify the works of God in the laborer's humble toil." It was not the patient tragedy of accepting, as an heroic and laborious burden, the weight of Adam's sin, which drove the first couple from Paradise, with the command that they should from henceforth work out their salvation with the sweat of their brow, through the instrumentality of pick, shovel, plow or spindle. It called attention to the joy which might be attached to the winding of silk, day after day, in the thought that perhaps—who knows?—one might be winding silk for the hem of some more fortunate person's cloak.

Two things begin to become clearer. First, one may realize how wise and proper it must have seemed, that nothing be allowed to disturb the religion of all the Pippas everywhere. Second, it begins to be apparent why Nietzsche, toward the end of the century, discovered that Christianity had apparently always been a religion particularly fitted for slaves; if it were one of the inevitable evils of existence that slaves should begin to reflect upon their social situation.

## LXIV

As we have already begun to see, several stray chicks, hatched along the way in the history of Christianity, came home to roost during the nineteenth century. One of these, startled again and again from the home perch, from days when Holy Roman emperors offended until the Congress of Vienna had put its program in operation, returned in 1815 to find no comfortable, ample, or long-enduring resting place—this the one hatched when ecclesiastical and baronial interests of property and prerogative became knit together in the feudal system. The second, which had a long history of various emphases, but came to be most clearly and independently enunciated when the eighteenth century undertook to amputate all unessentials from Christian faith, began to make more persistent appearance after 1848, as we have noted in the preceding chapter, when the poorer classes might begin to ask what profit it was to them if the Christian or any other religion did stabilize the existent social order. Still a third—the claims of the papacy to temporal power, with the right of the successor of Peter to rule as a temporal prince over a realm of rather elastic geographical boundaries—is to occupy us in a later chapter.

A fourth, fledged early in the history of the Church, but grown a sizeable cock with the Reformation, to find its feathers ruffled at least among the gusty currents of the *Aufklärung,* was soon to find them bedraggled, inundated.

The theories of natural religion, or philosophizings about the nature or basis of religion which followed, made atheists, skeptics, or religious persons of other than the traditional sort, out of some of the more educated and speculatively disposed, whose mental patterns were sufficiently complex to admit of readjustment without complete demolition. But, the movement which we have as yet left unnoted, though slow to forge to such conspicuous place as turned the eyes of any broad class upon it with persistent interest, was to arouse, as the nineteenth century advanced in its early second half, doubts and questioning in increasing numbers of the more simple and trusting religious hearts, troubling those whose faith still reposed secure upon belief in a verbally inspired Bible which the Roman Catholic Church assumed, and about which Protestantism had so largely built.

The tremendous tragedy of demolished faith in a literal inspiration of the Bible, for those who knew it personally and had fed upon it, can hardly be exaggerated. Even the Old Testament, despite the complexities and inconsistencies inevitable in a collection of writings spread over a very long period of composition and edited and reëdited many places, becomes for the naïve reader of implicit faith, a marvelous series of fairy stories, in which the hero or heroine, with whom the reader's imagination becomes identified, always finds, or may expect, a happy ending. So considered, such a collection of tales of the saints and martyrs as that of Voragine, collected and edited in the thirteenth century, is nowhere at all, and it is not strange that, wherever Bible reading came in, medieval tales of the saints went out. Where was there to be found such deep, rich, sonorous lyrical religious poetry as in the Psalms? The Middle Ages touched the popular religious emotions with other arts than poetry—with architecture, sculpture, pageantry. The New Testament presented God walking among men, talking to them such words as made every trial or misfortune at least easier to bear and face, healing their diseases, dying for them, in a tragedy about which the whole history of mankind might be made, was made, to turn; rising for their comfort with a promise which made bitter passages of life but the fasting which prepared empty stomachs for a great feast of thanksgiving and repletion. For those who so read the New Testament the intervention of the saints vanished as no longer satisfactory, just as tales of the saints before those of the Old Testament.

The intelligent, if otherwise uneducated, might gain from persistent reading of the Bible liberated imaginations, and imaginations which were liberated by great minds and lofty personalities.

One might gain from it alone even a deep and complex understanding of human reactions in circumstances of many sorts. Witness the uneducated tinker, John Bunyan. The influence of Bible reading, upon civilization in Protestant countries particularly, can hardly be overestimated. It did so much to make two of the most important modern languages (English and German) that its influence upon these languages could hardly be eliminated by the gradual process which alters the choice and significance of words.

Such a book was more than a book: it was an anchor, that is to say it was an anchor so long as one believed it to be like no other book. What were the opinions of scientists against such a book? One believer might have washed the dirty linen of some scientist; another might have trundled him in a perambulator. There can be nothing inspired about one you have as a nurse trundled in a perambulator. You might as a charwoman look in upon the study of a scientist while he was writing one of his books. Who had ever looked on while God whispered in the ear of one of the authors of the Bible—or why authors? How many ever thought to ask themselves whether they were one or many?

Such a book you can touch nowhere, or you touch it everywhere, in the minds of a large number of people—and by no means always such simple people—if once the belief be deeply imbedded in them that it is no human affair.

And it is no easy matter to touch it anywhere. Put in bad company such a book may shake off the company, as the Reformation proved, by eliminating the company and saving the book. For even the Catholics admitted that the Reformation had sprung more than from anything else from abuses in the historical Church. It was soon, however, made evident that, whatever the virtues of this book, there was nothing about it which guaranteed against its getting into new bad company.

But there is one indirect way of attacking the influence of such a book. Give the man who trusts in it another moving conception, give him an idea which sets in motion his desires and emotions, a vision he believes not only desirable but achievable, and then the book either goes with him, or one or the other is thrown overboard.

So, before considering the neglected movement set in motion by the *Aufklärung,* we must keep it in mind that, as this movement got well under way, a growing number of thousands, growing millions, were possessed of another moving idea, and every attempt to urge them to rest content in their religious traditions, so long as those who urged seemed at the same time obstacles to the other inspiring adventure, were only so many reasons to convince that the book would not go with them whither they were intent upon going.

This was when and how that cock, matured in the Reformation period, came home to roost at an unfavorable moment. Just as the poorer classes, or many among them, began to fear lest the ideas of liberty and equality launched by the eighteenth century were going to be stopped somewhere short of themselves, just as revolutionary movements inspired, not among the middle but among the lower classes, began to rumble, and to be repressed, it began to leak out into broader and broader circles that the authority of the Bible was being riddled by the learned.

Let us turn back to follow this movement briefly.

Way back in the early history of the Church, as early even as the third century, it had been possible to draw a line of distinction between Old and New Testament miracles. Evidently still earlier, as evidenced by those gospels chosen and those rejected when an authoritative list of Christian writings arose, it was possible to draw lines among reputed miracles surrounding the life of Jesus. One was not, for example, very early in Christian history, obliged to believe that Jesus miraculously pulled out to fitting length the board his father had carelessly cut too short. Doubtless the question of whether or not the Bible could or could not be questioned anywhere would have been definitely settled earlier, had there been any particular earlier reason for settling it. But when the question of the authority of the historical Church arose, in the Reformation, it was brought about, for the first time definitely in Christian history, that the Bible was to become a popular book, and that it was to be believed literally from cover to cover. There were soon millions of people who knew quite as well that Joshua had, with the assistance of Jehovah, caused the sun to stand still while he captured the city of an enemy, as they knew that Jesus had been crucified on Calvary for their redemption from that sin they had inherited from Adam. It was useless to attempt to convince most of these people that any Christ of the Gospels could save them from their sins, if the sun had not stood still over Gibeon.

So Biblical criticism, as old in certain respects as Origen and Jerome—older than either of them no doubt—came to be a matter of great importance to the Christian world, and we are obliged to turn for some moments to trace its course.

It is impossible here to note even the landmarks in the history of Biblical criticism. It is a long story, full of many complexities and subtleties, most of which only become comprehensible in the chain of many other complexities and subtleties. No one has yet hit upon the idea of attempting to make a matter of common and popular knowledge the trained and instinctive susceptibilities which guide the connoisseur in passing judgment upon the genuineness of some supposititious work of Rembrandt or Leonardo da Vinci. Yet a larger percentage of the problems of Biblical criticism are as much the matter of highly developed special knowledge and experience as that required in rendering a respectable opinion as to the genuineness of some master painter's reputed work.

What most interests us here is to note something of how this new monster first crept silently, and then suddenly began to stalk menacingly toward the consciousness of broader masses of people.

In a sense, the attitude from which Biblical criticism grew may be traced to that same philosopher, Spinoza, already discussed, who wrote a book upon metaphysics under the title *Ethics*. Spinoza's theory that the religious value of theological dogmas lay, not in their theoretical truth, but in their practical potency to promote ethical action, gave him liberty to consider critically, not only theological dogmas from a scientific standpoint, as a field of intellectual inquiry, but also the Biblical books upon which Christian dogma was believed to rest. He made some interesting discoveries, which need not detain us. Then the physicists, as they went on elaborating after Descartes the conception of natural law, began quite naturally to raise questions concerning those apparent divergencies from this regularity in nature, known as miracles.

What is known as *textual* Biblical criticism, the detailed critical task of attempting to clarify the Biblical text itself from discoverable errors, had its initial modern impulse in the sixteenth century, as we have already seen, when the first modern attempts were made to establish and publish a valid uncorrupted Greek text of the New Testament. The attempts to establish a Hebrew text of the Old Testament had its beginnings at about the same time, but proceeded more slowly owing to less frequent and satisfactory knowledge of the Hebrew.

The general effect of this textual criticism upon popular opinion, when in the nineteenth century knowledge of what was going on in this field became more widely disseminated, was to lead many to believe that the Bible texts had been discovered so corrupt, so diverted from some pristine purity by interpolation and alteration, for some purpose or other, that it had no longer any historical authority. Certain people at least came apparently to believe that Christianity might originally have been almost anything they might imagine it to have been, and had gradually been changed into something else, by the comparatively simple expediency of altering the Bible, in order to gain authority for the change made in the religion.

This sort of popular opinion hit, of course, wide of the true mark; and generally because it did not know that, in so far as particular types of error might be traced, they did not appear, certainly for the very large majority of cases, to have proceeded from any such process at all, and also that the percentage of discernible corruption was entirely too small to be accountable to any such source. It also made one important, though natural enough, false assumption: that the Bible had always in Christian history been sought as the basis for everything which had ever become a part of traditional Christianity, in a sense anything approximating to the way in which Protestantism had come to seek its authority in Scripture.

But an even more unsettling element of Biblical criticism, from the popular standpoint, was what came to be known as the *higher criticism.*

Higher criticism, though working with the results of textual criticism, had another and broader purpose. This purpose was: first to discover what validity the Biblical documents had as historical data; and then, with delicate discrimination, to attempt the drawing of lines of interpretative separation between underlying fact and the conceptions and language in which the Biblical writings had mirrored these facts.

With the passing of the Middle Ages, history had been reborn in a new sense. In general medieval histories were compounded of two elements, annals and tales. In general the medieval chronicler was not content to record his own time merely. He began, often with Adam and Eve, and more usually long before his own time. He proceeded by copying down, in some paraphrase, all he could find in some early chroniclers of times preceding his own, and then he appended, one might almost say in the style of diary or memoirs, such facts of his own time as he had actually seen or had heard others tell of. The Renaissance began to be interested in history in a new sense, and for another reason. History was now being, in a more self-conscious sense, *made* by some aspiring individuals, and they were interested in learning something of the manner in which before them other men had made history. Princes and politicians generally were eager to learn principles, according to which they might make conquests, and how afterwards they might assure the stability of the conquests made, by the arts of government.

Before the seventeenth century had closed a new and more philosophical conception of history had come to life, which was to expand and grow all through the eighteenth century. Historians began to be interested again, as some historians of ancient times had been, in the process of history, the changing fortunes of nations and peoples, the growth and dissolution of what we know as civilizations. The very title of one of these works of the later seventeenth century is indicative of the new temper. A French forerunner of the *Aufklärung* (Saint-Évremond) sets down *Reflections on the Diverse Character of the Roman People, in Different Periods of the Republic.*[1] Such history is quite another thing than annals and tales. It looks back, not only expecting to find the past different from the present, but to speculate as to the reason why. It begins to assume that many of the reasons for the present at least lie in this past. It may also look forward, assuming that the reasons for the future lie in the present. Indeed out of this movement of historical speculation arose the *idea of progress* which lent the glittering aura of enthusiastic hope to the whole movement which culminated in the French Revolution.

Of the influence of this idea of progress, in later development, upon European religion, we shall have more to say later. But this speculative history, armed with the conceptions of natural philosophy which were taking hold everywhere, very naturally began to reflect upon tales handed down regarding past history, which seemed to make of past history something different from the present in respects scarcely allowable, when the universe was conceived as a reign of simple, unchanging law. In short, they began to notice that tales were told about the past which would be immediately set down as preposterous, if told about the present. Historians began to attempt to explain these tales, as statements which could not be true to fact, but which, however, were not without a reason for existence. So we may begin, as an example, with the very first paragraph of Saint-Évremond's *Reflections.* He writes that, just as family genealogies always aim to discover some illustrious progenitor of their family line, so nations, once risen to some measure of greatness, seek out some illustrious founder, whose altogether unusual character explains prophetically the greatness of the nation. Such a founder, Saint-Évremond reflects, is not unnaturally connected in some direct way with the divinity which is the object of national worship.[2]

---

[1] Saint-Évremond, *Reflexions sur les divers gênies du peuple romain, dans les differents temps de la Republique,* 1663.

Such historical reflection is already, it may be plainly seen, an explanation of miracle. And so in general it may be said that no one factor, nor indeed all other factors put together, contributed so much to inspire the growth of the higher Biblical criticism, as the problem of miracles which both Testaments of the Bible present. Certain presuppositions, which set aside and apart Biblical history, as differing from all other history, because it was a revelation of God, slowed up the process of applying similar methods to the consideration of the Biblical text, save such as were instigated by persons radically unsympathetic, who in general used the methods in undiscriminating destruction of Christianity entire. But, as the natural religion of the deists, supplemented by considerations as to the element of personal emotional need that religion appeared to satisfy, and the ethical values which it seemed to conserve, grew into that something a little different and more complex, which came to be known as the *philosophy of religion,* more and more minds might ask the question as to just how much and how little miracle there necessarily was, either in Christianity, or behind the documents of the Bible. This question posited gave to the higher criticism a broad speculative basis upon which to go to work, and it began to go to work.

The beginnings were crude enough. Attempts to interpret miracles on the basis that they represented mistaken accounts of actual natural events, often introduced methods of explanation more ponderously difficult to believe than the miracles they attempted to reduce to the boundaries of commonplace experience. One such interpreter, for example, decides that perhaps, as a basis for the story of Adam and Eve's fall from grace, "the human constitution had at the very beginning become impaired by the eating of a poisonous fruit."[3]

---

[2] "Il est de l'origine des peuples, comme des généalogies des particuliers. On ne peut suffrir des commencements bas et obscures. Ceux-ci vont à la chimère; ceux-la donnent dans les fables." So Saint-Évremond begins his *Reflections.*

> The flame and smoke which ascended from Mount Sinai, at the giving of the law, was merely a fire which Moses kindled in order to make a deeper impression upon the imagination of the people, together with an accidental thunderstorm which arose at that particular moment. The shining of his countenance was a natural effect of being over-heated: but it was supposed to be a divine manifestation, not only by the people, but by Moses himself, he being ignorant of the true cause.[4]

But even when assisted by phantasy, this type of explanation was subject to limitations. During the eighteenth century an anonymous work, posthumously published by Lessing for the deceased author, accused Jesus of having used legerdemain to deceive his followers. Once one began interpreting all the Bible miracles *naturally,* as it was called, it was difficult indeed to blink at the fact that, in the Gospel documents, Jesus is clearly presented as consciously performing what were certainly taken by those about to be miracles. A clever, but what some are bound to feel rather oily, interpretation of the life of Jesus, written by Ernest Renan a little after the middle of the nineteenth century (1864) apologized for Jesus' apparent miracles, on the ground that the religious leader soon discovered that, in order to make his ethical message effective, he found himself forced into the rôle of magician.[5] Indeed it was rather difficult to carry the naturalistic type of explanation very far beyond the Old Testament without getting into difficulty.

Indeed the true field of battle more and more clearly gathered about the New Testament. There were old authorities among Church Fathers, in whose works might be found justification for treating the Old Testament allegorically. Kant, for example, insisted that one was not justified in interpreting morals after the words of the Bible, but must on the contrary interpret the Bible according to the enlightened principles of morals.[6] With this idea in mind Kant had gone behind the Bible, declaring that, as the Scriptures were the sole criterion of doctrinal truth (*Norm des Kirchenglaubens*), so rational religion and the scholarly historical study of the text were the final authorities in the matter of Biblical interpretation.[7] People had long since accepted the belief that there were such things as *pagan myths* which had to do with pagan religious practices, and that there were *historical myths* which played important rôles in the early history of peoples pushed by Christian hypothesis outside God's scheme of revelation. Little by little the myth crept over parts of the Old Testament. Finally and definitely, in the work of a German scholar, David Friedrich Strauss, the theory of myth laid hold upon the last stronghold of Christian Biblical authority: the New Testament, not here and there, but throughout (1835).

---

[3] The Introduction to Strauss' *Leben Jesu* (trans. into English by George Eliot) gives a brief review of attempts to explain Bible miracles up to his time, 1835.

[4] *Ibid.,* Introd.

[5] *Vie de Jésus.*

There is too much in Strauss' work which is to-day out of date and superseded to make it of importance for us to consider his interpretation of the entire Gospel narrative with his mythical theory. In the field of higher criticism it inspired a mass of new investigation. In the field of myth it inspired some brand-new myths. In the field of Christian popular opinion it raised a storm.

Strauss did not, of course, believe that myths began to accumulate about the person of Jesus from nowhere in particular and for no particular reason. He believed, and doubtless with excellent reason, that the most important incentive behind the mythological accumulation was the belief that Jesus was the Messiah of Jewish prophecy and hope. He also considered, as did other prominent scholars for some time, that the First Gospel (according to Matthew) was the oldest and most authentic. This Gospel more than any other one applied words of old prophecy to the career of Jesus, and furnished an obvious clew. Strauss hunted out many places where the interpretation of Jesus' acts after the pattern of Old Testament story or prophecy might account for miraculous

[6] "Ich . . . frage, ob die Moral nach der Bibel, oder der Bible vielmehr nach der Moral ausgelegt werden müsse." *Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft,* III, vi.

[7] *Ibid.,* III, vi.

accounts in the New Testament. Also he did something more and further: he discovered traces, in the New Testament literature, of different and not always harmonious opinion within the early Christian community. The working out of this problem fell to a theologian of the University of Tübingen in Germany, resulting in a school of criticism, which explained more or less the whole of the New Testament literature as polemic and tendacious, inspired by two most important types of Christian opinion, one of which continued to believe the new religion but a reformed Judaism, the other of which, inspired by Paul, was a clear break with Judaism. In general, the Tübingen School believed the New Testament literature arose out of this controversy, and in an attempt to harmonize it. Their point was exaggerated, but there was quite enough truth to it to lead to many definite steps toward understanding the New Testament.

The tendency of this earlier criticism was to set the date of composition of the four Gospels as late as possible. There was a decided limit to the possible lateness, which lay in the fact that certain Christian literature of the second quarter of the second century referred to and quoted from all of them. But a late dating seemed to make the gathering of myth, and also the process of arriving at some definite type of common-ground opinion, and generally accepted tradition more easily understood.

The next important discovery, which came more and more to rest upon solid ground, was that the Second Gospel (according to Mark), and not the First, was for its general framework of narrative the most trustworthy, as it was also the first to reach its approximate present form. When the clew had been discovered, it was not difficult to establish the fact that the authors, both of the First and of the Third Gospels, had used, in composing their narratives, an account which was substantially that of our present text of Mark's Gospel. However, both the First and Third Gospels contain a large amount of material not to be found in Mark, and the larger part of this material appears both in the First and the Third Gospels, though in very different arrangement. This evidence pointed to another *source* besides Mark's account, which had been used by both of the other two authors, who could be shown also, by much evidence, to have neither of them known the account of the other. It therefore seemed almost certain that there was, at the time Matthew and Luke were written, another rather generally known and accepted written work about Jesus besides the Gospel of Mark. This second work, however, was hardly a narrative account of his public career, but rather a collection of sayings and teachings. The existence of some such work was generally assumed by critics, and to it was often given the descriptive title, "Logia," a Greek word meaning *sayings* or *oracles*. This was not all of the complexity discovered. Both Matthew and Luke could be shown to contain material not only independent of Mark, but independent of each other, and therefore presumably not contained in the assumed "Logia."

In short, it appeared certain that, by the time the First and Third Gospels were written, not only was there a fairly generally known narrative, attributed to Mark, but some considerable amount of other written, as well as doubtless oral tradition concerning Jesus. The "Preface" to the Third Gospel now became very significant. It reads:

> Forasmuch as many persons have taken in hand the task of drawing up an orderly narrative, concerning those things which have been brought to fulfillment among us, just as they handed them on to us, who were from the beginning eyewitnesses and fellow workers of the word, so it has seemed fitting for me also, having followed up the course of all these things carefully from the beginning, to write them down for you, most excellent Theophilus, in order that you might come to know the underlying assurance relating to the teachings in which you have been instructed.[8]

Here was definite corroboration of the fact, which might from other evidence be inferred, that, at the time the Third Gospel was written, there was a more or less settled body of *teaching* in which converts were instructed—that is to say a not necessarily written, but more or less uniform *catechism;* and that there were also documents, claiming to come from eyewitnesses and fellow workers, from among which the certain truth must be sought out, quite possibly because there was no complete harmony among these documentary witnesses.

---

[8] Luke I. 1-4.

To all of this the Fourth Gospel added another note, in part of corroboration, in part of complication. From very early times it had been clearly perceived that this Fourth Gospel was set in a sense apart from the other three. It alone, of all the Four Gospels, made the definite internal claim to have as its source an apostle; and not only an apostle, but that particular apostle nearest to the spiritual heart of Jesus, "whom Jesus loved . . . who also leaned back upon his breast" at the Last Supper; of whom it came to be said that Jesus had himself predicted that this "disciple should not die" until Jesus had come again in glory.[9] Very early it had come to be known as the *spiritual Gospel,* the inner kernel of the divine message.[10] Upon it, far more than any other of the Gospels, the theology of the Church had been established. There was nothing in any of the other three Gospels which gave any evidence that their authors knew anything about this Fourth Gospel. On the other hand, it was at least possible to draw up a case for the fact that its author knew, and consciously, though not directly, controverted and corrected in minor details the accounts of the others.[11] It certainly possessed a very different basis of historical incident, quite independent in important respects from the others. Nor was this by any means all. In it Jesus acted in a different sort of way; spoke in a sense a quite different sort of language; moved in a different realm of ideas.

However, and naturally enough since it had played such a large rôle in the theological interpretation of the personality of Jesus, many were most of all reluctant to see any disturbing hand laid

[9] John XXI. 20-24.

[10] This feeling persisted, even among the *liberals* of the eighteenth century. Lessing writes (1777), "Dass wir sonach nur zwei Evangelium haben, den Matthäus und Johannes, das Evangelium des Fleisches und das Evangelium des Geistes, haben schon die alten Kirchenväter erkannt und ist eigentlich noch von keinem neuern Orthodoxen geleugnet worden," *Theologische Nachlass.*

[11] Such is the thesis of a work by Abbott, *The Fourfold Gospel.*

upon this Gospel, despite all evidence that it must have been written some fairly considerable time after the others. This, however, is a detail of controversy we must pass over. The important fact was that the Four Gospels could now be arranged in a sort of three-grade hierarchy: Mark, Matthew-Luke, John; and from this hierarchy might be traced a considerable amount of myth-making. At this point there came a split among critics. Some, with considerable hint as to what had gone on between Mark and John, attempted to see if the kernel of fact behind Mark might be more clearly deciphered. Others, noting how much myth had accumulated during the period from Mark to John, assumed that before Mark an even greater amount of myth had already drawn together; so much in fact that no Jesus had ever existed, but that the whole story was a myth, which invented a prophet to give themselves an historical personage, with whom to afterwards clothe a doctrine which had been formulated among some religious group. We cannot stop here to examine this hypothesis. It appears, something like the *naturalistic* attempts to explain away the miracles of the Bible, to invent a miracle more difficult to swallow than any it attempts to remove. Nor can we proceed to follow attempts to construct critically an actual life and personality of Jesus, which gathers up in one tremendous task all the puzzling complexities and subtleties of every element of Biblical criticism. What is more our immediate interest is to sum up, in a rough way, the effect of all this tampering with things believed long since settled, upon the minds of those who could not have been expected to know what it was that these critics were about, but could only see ruthless hands, tearing away at the object of their worship, about whom were gathered all their hopes, when they turned, in moments of reflection or misery, their eyes or thoughts toward an Eternity which was expected to right all the wrongs, and heal all the wounds of the present.

Let us turn, not to one of the inarticulate many, who first became terrified to feel an anchor slipping, until soon they appeared to ride free upon the bay, if anything a little more comfortably than before. Let us rather first go to one of the most grandly and tragically frightened of all that troubled period, who puts for us in sharp contrast, at the approach of death, the comfort of faith, and the fear that this faith might be in vain.

> Firmly I believe and truly
> God is three, and God is One;
> And I next acknowledge duly
> Manhood taken by the Son.
> And I trust and hope most fully
> In that manhood crucified;
> And I hold in veneration,
> For the love of Him alone,
> Holy Church, as his creation,
> And her teachings, as his own.

Then a sudden change comes over the dying man:

> I can no more; for now it comes again,
> That sense of ruin, which is worse than pain,
> That masterful negation and collapse
> Of all that makes me man; as though I bent
> Over the dizzy brink
> Of some sheer infinite descent;
> Or worse, as though
> Down, down for ever I was falling through
> The solid framework of created things,
> And needs must sink and sink
> Into the vast abyss. And, crueller still,
> A fierce and restless fright begins to fill
> The mansions of my soul. And, worse and worse,
> Some bodily form of ill
> Floats on the wind, with many a loathsome curse
> Tainting the hallow'd air, and laughs and flaps
> It hideous wings,
> And makes me mad with horror and dismay.[12]

Newman's solution of this problem of fright is matter for another chapter. So, in a sense, is the following cry of Matthew Arnold, for an even more immediate chapter:

---

[12] John Henry, Cardinal Newman, *The Dream of Gerontius.*

The Sea of Faith
Was once, too, at the full, and round earth's shores
Lay like the folds of a bright girdle furl'd.
But now I only hear
Its melancholy, long, withdrawing roar,
Retreating, to the breath
Of the night wind, down the vast edges drear
And naked shingles of the world.

Ah, love, let us be true
To one another! for the world, which seems
To lie before us like a land of dreams,
So various, so beautiful, so new,
Hath really neither joy, nor love, nor light,
Nor certitude, nor peace, nor help for pain;
And we are here as on a darkling plain
Swept with confused alarms of struggle and flight,
Where ignorant armies clash by night.[13]

Both of these men had passed through the chilling fear that fell for a time over many, with the thought that Jesus might be nothing more than either a myth or a man, and that neither a myth nor a man seemed capable of bearing the tremendous burden of human salvation with which Christianity had freighted Christ.

Such men as have been just quoted lived through this tragedy, and so did others less articulately. But one does not expect the majority to take anything so tragically which has no clear strangle hold upon their throats. The hope of salvation touched more gently, nearer the stomach than the throat for most. The whole idea of salvation offered by Christianity became gradually more and more a less tangible thing. Humanity, though Christian in many gestures, floated a little like a ship, moored on one side by a spider web to a star, on the other by a taut cable to a substantial wharf. One glanced from one hope of salvation to the other; left the slender spider filament for what it was worth, and strengthened the cable on the port side.

The material for this strengthening was at hand, and we may turn to see how substantial a material it appeared to be.

[13] Matthew Arnold, *Dover Beach.*

## LXV

We have been considering, in the preceding chapters of this section on the Dissolutions and Solutions of Religious Authority, various accumulating ideas and forces, tending most of them to spread among different classes of society a considerable variety of reactions which ranged from a new sort of religious enthusiasm of political caste, in which however patriotism and religion might so mingle as to obscure any distinction between the Christian and the good citizen, and which might easily put the political state in the place of God; through various types of religious indifference; toward hostility, based on one extreme upon intellectual presuppositions, on the other in a growing belief that Christianity was an instrument of social tyranny.

We may now turn to consider two conceptions of growing definiteness and influence, of a positive character, neither of which took in Christianity as an essential element, both of which claimed and won a large measure of enthusiastic adherence which might often appear to embrace all the emotional and intellectual aspirations involved in the religious complex, and toward which, in consequence, traditional Christianity was ultimately obliged to take up some one or more definite attitudes.

In being drawn toward this situation of enforced decision, this much at least had emerged from the *mêlée* of upheaval in ideas and social-political institutions; that there was a growing consciousness of a certain effectiveness, for the individual and for society, in the attitude of *faith,* as inspiring definite deeds. It meant a great deal to Europe generally to see two racial units, with nothing to bind them beyond past traditions, forge from the memories of the past, out of faith in a common heritage, German for one, Latin for the other, two new national units among the peoples of Europe. The Germanic empire of Karl der Grosse (when we refer to him as Charlemagne we forget the rootage and obscure the later history of this empire) inspired faith in a lofty and corporate destiny for Germans; the historic glories of Rome, as national consciousness shook free of chains binding peoples to the property claims of important ruling families, warmed and solidified the ideal of a united Italy, with its capital in Rome. Faith, devotion warm and persistent to an as yet unaccomplished vision or aspiration, accomplished things; so it was concluded.

Carlyle carried from Germany to England the message that faith, so essential an element of religion that in many contexts the two terms religion and faith might now appear interchangeable, possessed a deed-energy, and a deed-energy which rested fundamentally upon the attitude a man took toward the universe which he perceived or felt surrounding him.

> It is well said, in every sense, that a man's religion is the chief fact with regard to him. A man's, or a nation of men's. By religion I do not mean here the church-creed which he professes, the articles of faith which he will sign and, in words or otherwise, assert; not this wholly, in many cases not this at all. We see men of all kinds of professed creeds attain to almost all degrees of worth and worthlessness under each and every one of them. This is not what I call religion, this profession and assertion. . . . But the thing a man does practically believe . . . the thing a man does practically lay to heart, and know for certain, concerning his vital relation to this mysterious Universe, and his duty and destiny there, that is in all cases the primary thing for him, and creatively determines all the rest. That is his *religion;* or it may be, his mere skepticism and *no-religion:* the manner in which he feels himself spiritually related to the Unseen World or No-World: and I say, if you tell me what that is, you tell me to a great extent what the man is, what the kind of thing he will do is.[1]

Such was the conception of the deed-value of religion as Carlyle set it forth in a series of essays written to show how the great changes effected in history resulted from the influence of heroic personalities, at the center of whose personal being burned a religious fire. At times, in his scolding of the English respectables, resting smug in petty social distinctions (*gigmanity* he took to calling them, from the way in which among these Philistines the fact that one was seen driving a gig placed one socially) a hero might seem to be merely someone who did not intend to be bamboozled into inactivity, by a lot of people who were so comfortable and complacent that they feared nothing so much as that someone might come along and disturb their comfort and complacency. But underneath the attitude was more positive, and fundamentally more hopeful even for gigmanity—"A great man has always been as lightning out of heaven; the rest of men waited for him like fuel, and then they too might flame." [2]

---

[1] Thomas Carlyle, *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History,* Lecture I (1840).

Here the *indifference* in matters of religion, so often commented upon from the time De Lamennais wrote his essay upon the subject in 1817, was turned from negative to positive. It made no difference, he said in effect, what sort of a religion a man had, but it did make a great deal of difference if in him burned some idea or attitude with a fire of religious zeal. Carlyle in another work clearly put the alternative—the *Everlasting Nay* of fear and doubt and criticism; the *Everlasting Yea* of faith and positive affirmation.[3]

Such a religion did not, in any essentiality, recite a creed. Nothing so much annoyed Carlyle as theological dispute, and he went out of his way to write the biography of one rather obscure clergyman he knew but slightly, for no other very clear reason than because this man had been persecuted as unorthodox. Religion was an energizer; religion gave determination to *do.*

Religion thus became the determination to realize something which burned as desire in the center of a man's being. Religion was emotionally excited *willing;* a deep and persistent decision that this or that will, or this or that will not, *be,* or come to achievement. And for such a religion the effective god became a projection, quite literally, a *throwing-forward* of faith. And so, for Carlyle by implication, and as formulated by others more definitely, God was no longer the creator of Man, but man was the creator of his god.[4] God was the intellectualized symbol of a striving, which striving was the thing that really mattered.

---

[2] *Ibid.,* end of chap. ii.

[3] *Sartor Resartus.*

[4] Conspicuously, Feuerbach, *Wesen der Religion.*

But a deity set before mankind as the projected goal of human striving might seem to face in two divergent directions. Proceeding in one of these directions religion would seem to inspire forceful *egoism,* self-realization. So indeed it was developed, toward a pessimistic conclusion by Schopenhauer, who demonstrated how the striving of desire forged definite limitations for the will, although the very impulse of the will was toward the negation of limitations. It was still later developed positively by Nietzsche, as a sort of heroic anarchy, the saints of this religion being *supermen,* who treated all codes and relations which impeded as mere barriers to be overleaped. Proceeding in the other direction religion might inspire *patriotism,* an ideal which melted the individual in a common mass of definite existent form. It might overleap unsatisfied all existing types of social unity or organization, to erect as its religious goal an ideal relationship of all human beings everywhere, thus begetting the *Religion of Humanity.*

And the difference between this religion of humanity and the social-political enthusiasms out of which the French Revolution grew was just in the matter upon which Carlyle set his emphasis. For the eighteenth-century *theophilanthropoi,* it was reason which would set about erecting the ideal social system. In the new religion of humanity, faith, the energy of desire, was to play a rôle of great, if not primary importance. "The significant characteristic of our species," writes Proudhon, "after thought, is *belief";* but when it comes to the matter of authority, to bind together human beings with some stability, "Authority, just as Divinity, is not a matter of knowing; it is, I repeat, a matter of faith." [5]

This religion of humanity is a complicated affair, but we must aim to understand it if we are to get any comprehensive conception of the idealistic goal, of the particular quality of the zeal, or a clear sense of the difficulties which gave the complicated complexion to the later nineteenth-century atmosphere, wherever it touched upon the problems drawn together in the religious complex.

---

[5] *Les Confessions d'un revolutionnaire, pour servir a l'Histoire de la Revolution de Février,* 1848. Preface.

The first thing to note about it is that it seemed to embrace certain contradictions, or polar emphases at least, which somehow had to be kept in consistent solution. The complication of reason with faith is one of these. At another we have already hinted, and this too the nineteenth century had added to the vision of the eighteenth-century reformers. The eighteenth century assumed that an intelligent government would assure personal liberty. The nineteenth developed two sorts of fear of diverging intention. Some feared liberty as a menace to stable government, others government as a menace to liberty. This clash, involving religion, liberty, and government is drawn together in another quotation from Proudhon:

> What Humanity seeks for in religion and calls God is itself. What the citizen seeks from government and calls King, Emperor, or President, is himself also—liberty. Beyond Humanity, no God . . . save for liberty, no Government.[6]

Further, since here our interest in this religion of humanity derives from its relation to the fate of Christianity in this nineteenth century, we should remember that Christianity had legitimately a social vision. Jesus had much to say about the "Kingdom of God," the "Kingdom of Heaven," or "of the Heavens." The early community, under persecution, placed this kingdom, this ideal community, decidedly in heaven. Augustine in his particular way divided the kingdom between earth and heaven. The medieval Church, in a particular way, aimed to appropriate the earth as an appendix at least to the kingdom of heaven. The Reformation aimed to modify this method of appropriation. But heaven, for the religion of humanity, became the achieved perfect earthly social order, as contemplated in emotional vision, and as directing social striving. And so the question might legitimately arise, as to whether Christianity should go with this religion of humanity, maintaining if it cared to do so its *Gospel,* as a beautifully aspiring expression of this humanitarian religion; whether it should renounce the new religion *au fond* and in principle; or whether

---

[6] *Ibid.,* Preface.

Christianity should undertake the very delicate task of meeting the new religion point by point, crisis after crisis, giving and taking.

So much in a general way as to the problems inherent in the humanitarian ideal, and as to the problem with which it presented itself to Christianity. The social gospel was to be offered in many programs of a great variety of emphases. It must suffice here to but sketch the earliest comprehensive presentation of it, in which provision was definitely made not only for religious emotion, but for religious symbol and ceremony.

This presentation had a precursor, a John the Baptist of a sort, with whom it began in both a visionary and a revolutionary way. Here the assertion was definitely made, that the religious duty of organized society was the betterment of the moral and material condition of the socially and economically least fortunate class. The visionary element of this religion, in its primitive form, was the hope of going immediately about this work of betterment, by a scientific reorganization of society. The prophet of the movement was one Claude Henri de Rouvrey, Comte de Saint-Simon who, though the term did not as yet exist, is usually considered the Father of Socialism. His most important work was entitled, *The New Christianity.* We need not here discuss his particular program. His personal influence helped to fix the social enthusiasm of the other Frenchman already referred to, Auguste Comte, who was a more consistent and comprehensive thinker, and first, and underneath everything, a brilliant mathematician. Mathematicians have a way of simplifying things, as naturally resulting from their habitual use of *X*'s, *Y*'s, and equations which, however complicated, are still simpler than the phenomena they generalize. Comte greatly simplified history, by dividing it into three stages, which stages, if we reinterpret his nomenclature, seem to be, a religious Middle Ages, a metaphysical *Aufklärung,* and a scientific Eternity. It appears to have been Comte's purpose to amputate the visionary element and the impatient element in Saint-Simon's religion, and refound society upon the basis of his new science—sociology.

This scientific endeavor was to enlist those emotions which warm faith to an energetic glow as a religion. Its deity, as already suggested, was Humanity. Comte had been born under the star of the religious calendar of the French Revolution, and when he formulated his religion he rested it also upon a new calendar. The experiment with a ten-day week was abandoned, but Comte did make one scientific improvement, which was to form his year of thirteen instead of twelve months. Each season, each month, each week, each day indeed, was consecrated to some branch of human achievement, which were all venerated in the persons of some three hundred and sixty-five, or six, new saints; all human beings who had in some conspicuous way contributed to the advancement of humanity. These, though more in number, may be compared with the personalities of Carlyle's *Hero Worship*.

There was an architectonic magnificence about the vast and beautifully articulated program of Comte. There was even a certain magnificence in the way in which he leaped over all difficulties in the intellectual realm run to cover by Kant's analysis, and still, as metaphysical speculation proceeded, to trouble others with antinomies, dilemmas, or polarities of one sort or another. With Comte knowledge proceeded, from geometry to mechanics, from mechanics to astronomy, from astronomy to physics, from physics to chemistry, from chemistry to biology, from biology to sociology, with firm, controlled and *positive* progress, step by step, from the most simple to the most complex conceptions. So it was to proceed in the matter of religion. Instead of proceeding, as Comte believed men always to have done, from wildly groping and ignorant superstition and theology, through metaphysics, to science, men were now to begin with science, in its purest, most abstract and certain form, and from thence were to proceed to religion as the final complex achievement of the intellect. Humanity was to manufacture its god, not as before out of its fears and ignorance, but with its intelligence.

It was a truly magnificent dream, put together with a sweep of imagination and a clarity of orderly conception such as put the German metaphysicians to shame. But—is there not always a troublesome "but"?—while Comte seemed untroubled by chronic conditions of polarity or dilemma in the way of positive knowledge, he did not remain unaware of something similar in his favorite field of sociology. Social development, he discovered, was embarrassed by the existence of two antagonistic attitudes, which in conflict wrought societies which, even when they proceeded from one condition to another, whether better or worse, caused them to do so in a disorderly, unscientific, and wasteful manner. There seemed always to be in society, *conservatives* and *revolutionaries:* those who did not seem to want society to move at all, and those who wanted affairs social to move too briskly.

Nor was this the only polarity in social motive. He found that humans might be governed by two divergent motives, egoism and altruism. Proceeding according to the former motive, men strove to get all the liberty, wealth, or general well-being possible for themselves. Proceeding according to the second, men sought these things rather for their neighbor, relying incidentally upon the probability that everyone was likely to turn out to be someone's neighbor, and profit indirectly. Comte did not put himself upon the side of the political economists who insisted that minding one's own business effectively was the best way to serve one's neighbors. He insisted that the proper motive of scientific society was altruism, in which every human being consciously seeks the good of his fellows.

The initial difficulty with Comte's social-religious program was that the science of sociology was of necessity a very complicated science, which no one had gone about creating before him. It would take time to get this science even well started, and until this science had got its data in some sort of order, Comte did not believe that society should move at all, since very naturally it would not yet know where to move in a positive and scientific direction. And meanwhile the very aspiration of his program was dissolved, by a type of philosophy which, like a great gulf, dissolved and swallowed up every problem whatsoever. This philosophy was that which gathered together every field of intellectual inquiry about the idea of *evolution.*

It is unnecessary here to trace early beginnings of the conception of change as an evolutionary development, rather than a mere flux and reflux of no constructive direction. In so far as religion was concerned evolution was to become disturbing in several ways; most popularly with respect to whether or not Adam was molded from the dust of the earth, and Eve formed from his midriff, whether or not unchanging laws of moral conduct were handed upon graven slabs of stone, upon a cloud-capped mountain top, to Moses, and whether or not the institutional and doctrinal system of the historic Christian Church had been arranged in conference with twelve apostles, just previous to the ascension of Jesus.

As a matter of fact, however, the idea of evolution began to be most important for religion, and for every matter which affected social ideal or order, when applied, as the idea of *progress,* to the changes of impulse, conception, or institutional pattern, in human society. "The whole succession of men," wrote Pascal late in the seventeenth century, "during the course of so many centuries, should be considered as one man, always living, and continually learning." [7] Montesquieu, in the first half of the eighteenth century, worked further toward a more definite idea of progress, by applying to politics and society the principles under which, in the physical world, motion was being reduced to broad general laws. Then, toward the end of the century Condorcet, hiding an outlaw at the time from a sentence to the guillotine, wrote a *Sketch of an Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Spirit,*[8] in which he presented history as the story of how mankind had gradually liberated itself from the tyranny of priests and rulers, predicting that, just as humanity had proceeded in a measure to rid itself of bad laws and institutions, so it would proceed to conquer ultimately, through indefinite future progress, all remaining human ills. He pictured men as starting from the social level of the animal world, as gaining knowledge, perfecting gradually types of labor, of life, and of social organization, culminating, so far as it was given him to trace this history, in the eighteenth-century

---

[7] *Préface sur Traité du Vide.*

[8] *Esquisse d'un tableau historique des progrès de l'esprit humain.*

*enlightenment* and the *French Revolution.* Herder did the job much better in Germany.[9] Then Hegel took up the idea, and made of it a formula according to which he arranged history, and every other field of knowledge experience as a form of thought, or of thinking activity. Progress came about with the assistance of a *concept,* which began as *potentially* everything, *actually* nothing. Then, as a sort of ontological automatic rifle, which reloaded for each shot from the recoil of the one preceding, this concept proceeded to leave behind it not one, but parallel or radiating paths, marking by the footprints of humanity, as religions of various sorts and stages, works of art, and political institutions. Footsteps, have we called these monuments of civilization? Perhaps we should rather liken them to discarded sheathing skins of a growing serpent on a long journey, which had been successively shed as they contracted him. And the serpent itself was, some at least suspected, God incarnate.

And so it may be seen that religious possibilities might connect themselves with the idea of evolution. The deity might remain humanity, if the concept appeared too abstract for religious purposes, as it most decidedly did. But a religion of humanity, so interpreted, accumulated a new and different element of comfort. The deity was no longer necessarily projected before, as the goal of aspiration, the consummation of a quest. Humanity journeyed —was essentially a traveler, and carried its goal in its traveling case, all that it was not at present wearing. Humanity was going just where humanity was going, and that was its goal. It was absurd to expect this traveler to be any other place in his journey, save just where he was; or to fear that he might land any other place, save just where he was going to land—provided he ever gave up traveling and took up residence permanently anywhere.

Of course no one ever formulated a creed of this religion along lines of such consoling simplicity. So stated it might have discouraged activity upon the part of individuals, as altogether unnecessary bother. It was, on the contrary, stimulating to activity, over which it shed a beneficent hopefulness. Try to imagine a Greek of the period after Pericles, disheartened, like Thucydides or Aristophanes, to see cherished ideals and institutions going to the dogs, and thinking of a Golden Age already past centuries earlier; or of some poor monk striving with flagellation toward a heaven which he might not attain until some centuries of purgatory after death were past; and then compare the satisfaction of believing that the whole creation is this moment better than at any moment previous, and inevitably destined to be still better next week.

---

[9] *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit.*

But this conception was destined to gain another element of satisfaction, and a further spur to energetic activity, from painstaking investigation in the animal kingdom. Charles Darwin discovered that wherever, among animal types, some individuals of the type are more adapted to the vicissitudes of the environment in which they find themselves than others of their species, the better adapted individuals tend to continue to live, and to produce offspring mated with the best adapted of the other sex, so that in the course of time the less well adapted are pushed, or starved, or frozen out. In this way every species works gradually toward more effectiveness in coping with its environment.

This discovery fell upon a favorable moment: just when Herbert Spencer was framing a philosophy of evolution which, instead of talking about such logical abstractions as *being, not-being,* and *becoming,* was to talk about more tangible scientific abstractions, such as *matter, motion, instability,* and *equilibrium;* and which, instead of talking about creative activity as *definition,* was to so talk as to make it seem a process of intelligently conforming. Living began to be popularly talked about as a *struggle for existence,* and affluent living as the *survival of the fittest.*

Herbert Spencer did not attempt to develop a philosophy of religion as a part of his system. On the contrary, in two chapters at the beginning of that work in which he laid down his general principles, he rather ushered out the possibility of such a philosophy.[10] The ultimate conclusion of these chapters is a matter of rather common knowledge. They defined a religious point of view to which was given a name much bandied about: agnosticism. Spencer intends these chapters to prove that all three alike, "Atheism, pantheism, and theism, when rigorously analyzed, prove to be absolutely unthinkable." What he appears rather to argue is, that they are none of them satisfactorily provable. They have, of course, all of them been thought through in very consistent ways, and the disconcerting fact is perhaps just the possibility of thinking any one or all of them through so consistently.

As a matter of fact Kant had long since developed a more clearly analyzed basis for agnosticism. At this point both Kant and Spencer agreed that there was an obligation of some sort to lead a "good life" of some sort, whether or not reasoned proofs of one sort of religion or another, of an entirely satisfactory kind, could be found. They differed, it might seem, in the question of incentive to such a life. Kant was convinced that there was an absolute obligation to lead this sort of life, even though you were killed for it. Spencer seemed to say that you had to live what the generality of your fellows had proven, by surviving, was a sufficiently good life, or you would be killed for it.

So far as agnosticism was concerned, there was little new about it save the name. Agnostics had been going to church more or less regularly for several generations before Spencer wrote, and did not cease to do so. Also, so far as the *survival of the fittest,* a phrase coined by Spencer himself on the basis of Darwin's discoveries, was concerned, people had been in general following the line of conduct it suggested for centuries more than history might accurately number. All that was new was the annunciation of this jungle law in the form of a phrase which might be conveniently used as a rational incentive to intelligent action, and the benediction it appeared to pronounce over the heads of those who, even without this new benediction, had very solid and tangible evidence of the fact that they were especially fitted to survive in the environment into which some hazard or providence had dropped them. Here, in short, was a new *doctrine of election,* which suddenly removed from a great number of important persons any essential reason for clinging to any Calvinistic remnants of religion which might remain.

---

[10] *First Principles.* Chap. i, "Religion and Science"; chap. ii, "Ultimate Religious Ideas."

This new doctrine of election, however, did not necessarily cause rejection of the old. If, for example, you are accustomed to carry a walking stick, and you come to be possessor of a second walking stick, that by no means obliges you to dispose of the older brother. You may choose to carry the two alternatively, finding this alternative one of life's little added satisfactions. But this second possession inevitably removes a measure of preciousness from the first, since now, were you to lose it, your habit of walking would in no way be interfered with.

But a doctrine such as that of the survival of the fittest was something more than a doctrine of election. It was also a doctrine of justification—that is of justification of the relentlessness of economic struggle, as Nature's law and plan which, if one still kept two walking sticks of election, might also be called God's way and plan.

Here, however, the matter was less simple. Just as we noted that Luther's doctrine of justification was of broader application than Calvin's doctrine of election, so a doctrine which erected relentless struggle into a scientific law of action, might be appropriated also by those plainly demonstrated by economic law not to be among the elect. And so laborers might band together in defense against employers; social doctrine might be formulated which attained the purity of election. And here there was no matter of alternative walking sticks. It was one thing to tell someone, in two different well-chosen doctrines, that he was among the elect. It was quite another thing to tell a differently situated person, one day in the week that he must be submissive to, the other six that he must prove his manly fitness by struggling against, his economic fate. And here the philosophy of evolution, which bore promise of a socially calming effect, by suggesting that all present ills were but the wrappings of blessings still unfolded, might turn frontwise a face of revolution, worn as a mask upon the back of its head. Here might again be disturbed the growing tacit agreement into which society's rulers had been drifting, that, everything else aside, Christianity was a good thing to keep alive for the sake of its effect upon the lower classes.

It was late in the nineteenth century when Nietzsche suggested that Christianity was a religion particularly fitted for slaves. By the time that this statement was made the militant element inspired by the religion of humanity had some time since declared hostility, both to Christianity and to the existent social order, with whatever might be hoped for as natural evolution of this order into a better one; and had chosen for itself a name, to emphasize its conviction of disenfranchisement, calling itself the *proletariat.* The suggestion of this name which they chose was that they were merely kept alive by the existing social order, that they might labor for it, and that they might beget laborers for succeeding generations of the economically favored.

Whether one insists that this radical element rejected Christianity, or that Christianity rejected it, makes after all little practical difference—they were definitely separated. Christians might now choose to fall back upon the comforting element in the philosophy of evolution, with religious faith that a divine providence was watching over and guiding the process of evolution; they might, with a continuing attitude of general loyalty, pick and choose, tune and tinker, scatter oases in too arid wastes, mitigate despair by dangling heaven just beyond the place where active earthly hopes might become disturbing to social equilibrium. Indeed a Christian, or a Christian institution, might do what any well and benevolently intentioned human being who mistrusted the disorder caused by social revolutions might do. He might attempt to discover just how much freedom of action his particular social-economic situation and the pressure of his fellow human beings allowed him, and try to do as little harm and as much good as possible with it. Precisely this the overwhelming majority of conscientious Christians had always done; but this tremendous thing had happened—it was now generally believed, and generally admitted by the overwhelming majority of those of formal Christian loyalty, that any well and benevolent intentioned human being could do this, and was likely to do it, whether or not formally Christian.

So much then for the two commanding and comprehensive conceptions of humanity and evolution with which Christianity was brought face to face in the latter half of the nineteenth century. But there were also negative dissolving elements of criticism in this half century, and there were tremendous negative and dissolving implications in the philosophy of evolution, which awakened fear, startled at least a part of Christendom, and numbers of Christians, into vigorous activity, in order to keep Christianity a distinctive thing, protect its corporate interests, and give it independent standing ground in a world which it had not lost the memory of having one time in considerable measure dominated. To those in another chapter we may now turn.

# LXVI

THE nineteenth century, as we get farther and farther from it, and still not far enough to clearly know the *dénouement,* and thus appraise the relative permanent significance of the many crossing and recrossing, divergent and contradictory currents of idea and incentive, becomes a more and more puzzling mixture of hope and disillusion, faith and fear, courage and cowardice. The first typical reaction of the twentieth century against the nineteenth was to look upon it as hypocritical and sentimental. It has been accused as particularly given to hiding things it preferred not to see, and as enjoying emotionally visions it did not dare to see through as actions. We cannot attempt either to appraise or discuss such judgments, but may suggest that religion was mixed up with most of the complexities of this century, and that, however much or little the nineteenth century was religious, it was a century much occupied with religion.

The complication with which this nineteenth-century preoccupation is enwrapped is perhaps due more than anything to the fact that, so far as the effective forces of the century were concerned, and judging by the reactions and cogitations of the influential leaders of thought and action, Christianity did not offer at any time during this century the broadly and clearly recognized savior; nor was it popularly looked upon as the vehicle of the popularly recognized salvation.

The century had a succession of three saviors: the first, liberty; the second, a very slippery savior which appeared first as social order, settled and stable, but which was transformed, transfigured if you will, into a changing flowing vision of humanity; the third, science, accepted as a more or less stable and static something in the midst of the change it effected all about.

As for the salvation most broadly acceptable during the entire period, it remained the same throughout this succession of saviors, each of which in turn was expected to insure it, and each of which in turn, actual fact and aspiration joining hands, appeared to have done so.

This salvation was clearly seen in the increase in the total social income, the very tangible increment to the aggregate wealth of humanity entire, not only in sum total but in variety of forms, many of which were newly created. It was, of course, no new thing to find the procurement and protection of material well-being a powerful incentive to and director of human activity and aspiration. What was new in the century was the different way in which this increased social income and tangible wealth was distributed, which held out hopes to classes and individuals of a sort which were new. The whole of society seemed alive and vibrant with a new liberated energy, in which faith and achievement mingled, in which faith was continually passing, with astonishing rapidity often, into achievement.

To follow this new salvation adequately would be itself a matter of many chapters. All that we may attempt here is to suggest that this new salvation laid at rest, to an entirely unexpected extent, all the fears for the social order which had gathered about the beginning of the century. It did even more than that. It made possible the assimilation, without dangerous shock of a socially disturbing character, of an astounding quantity of dissolution, which spared almost nothing among the mass of long accepted authorities of idea and institution upon which the security of organized society had long been believed to rest. So far as the fears with which the beginning of the century had reacted against the destructive criticism of the eighteenth century were concerned, they had been more than realized. The astonishing thing was that, in 1880, society seemed far more stable than in 1830. Revolutionary philosophies and active movements were by no means dead, but they had come to be less and less actively feared. The new salvation had reached even far among the lower classes, for whom these revolutionary philosophies and movements were now almost exclusively framed.

Another astonishing thing was happening. Science, of which it had been said in the preface to Napoleon's *Concordat,* quoted some chapters back, that it would always remain the portion of but a small minority, was becoming a recognized authority with every class of society. This fact is more astonishing than may seem upon its face to us to-day. Were people in the mass more deeply moved by "demonstration" than Napoleon's preface suspected? Did they demand less than he imagined "authoritative maxims"? Perhaps the truth is rather that here again the beginning of the century had neglected to realize that science, too, might frame authoritative maxims, which to be authoritative demanded only the acceptance of the authority. Perhaps also it was too early for him and his religious advisers to realize that science might become two quite different things: at once an analytical method of attacking speculatively problems relating to the universe, and man's ultimate destiny in it; and a handmaid and instrument of industry, commerce, and every other force busy with the task of increasing social income and material wealth.

As the latter, science more and more definitely contributed, as the century advanced, to that salvation which the nineteenth century had placed in the center of its corporate effort and aspiration. Here it gathered broadly that authority which might be set behind its more theoretical and speculative conclusions.

But what, we may properly ask here, was the bearing of this upon Christianity? Its bearing was too many-sided for adequate discussion here. It bred, for example, the conception of an inherent warfare between science and religion. On the one hand history might be interpreted as a long struggle in which religion had always been an enemy to the diffusion of intellectual light. On the other hand, those having some reason to fortify the position of religion, in themselves or others, might undertake to show that, properly interpreted, nothing of reliable conclusion, among scientific conceptions of recognized validity, either upset religion's metaphysical basis or crowded it out of a legitimate place among humankind. The varied attacks, to which one new science after another contributed, cannot be even suggested here. There are many books full of them, which in part at least, few of the reading public of the last half century have not read. The types of adjustment and defense on the part of religion are not less varied, but on the contrary rather more so. We are not attempting to trace here the course of religious thought, but rather to merely sketch the broad sweep of the tide of Christianity, turning among, and turned by, the varying winds of change among the impulses and ideas that have moved Europeans in the broadest mass.

Viewed from this broad standpoint there was a marked change in the status of Christianity, when one compares the first three decades of the nineteenth century with the three which immediately followed the middle of the century. During the former of these two periods, those who made it their business to study or direct the broad social forces, were busy attempting to place the traditional religion of Europe in its most effective rôle and form among the institutions which strengthened and ordered society. In the latter of these periods those who made it their business to study or direct the fortunes of the Christian religion, were much occupied with the attempt to maintain for Christianity a recognized and recognizable place and function in European society. In the former period Christianity had authoritative and influential defenders. In the latter period Christianity was very largely left with the task of defending itself. The broadest example of this alteration in the situation may be found in the fact that the century, as it advanced, saw more and more clearly marked movements to separate, in so far as corporate and institutional religion was concerned, the Church or churches, and the State or states; and repeated clashes between Church and State as to their respective fields of independent influence and activity.

These self-defensive efforts and struggles are by no means simple. They are complicated by the fact that the different important nations of Europe did not go through the various marked changes in the situation of religion in society in contemporaneous order. The same nation was not always and everywhere in the van or laggard in this movement. There was continual pull and strain, not only within but among nations. There was also another broad basis of complication. This movement was interested in safeguarding, in various mixtures, two separable religious interests. One of these interests centered in the problem of saving religion, in some stable and authoritative form, for those individuals who, among the changes and dissolutions of the century, found no diminishing need of the sort of religious anchor afforded by Christianity. The other interest centered in the safeguarding of institutional prerogatives, which were linked to an historic tradition which had formerly given Christianity a far more dignified rôle to play than it appeared to enjoy in the nineteenth century.

The safeguarding of Christianity for the comfort and hope it afforded the individual, in so far as it was an adaptation of Christianity to changing conditions, is a matter of too many complications, with as yet too little clarity of line, for us to attempt to sketch it here. It is, very largely, the history of Protestantism in the nineteenth century. Protestantism was born with the forces which at last attained freedom of movement in this century. This cycle of European civilization has not yet sufficiently far proceeded to begin to trace adequately its significant lines. The movements of adjustment, in idea and activity, run in many directions, some apparently crossing and conflicting. Perhaps the most significant tendency which may be noted was the gradual elimination, as matter for polemical discussion or acrimonious difference of opinion, of sectarian lines. Sectarian bodies to be sure retained institutional independence, but rather, so far as the general body of adherents was concerned, as ministering to different types of religious temperamental needs, than as enunciating varying dogmatic emphases of such importance as to cause controversy.

But such flattening out of dogmatic differences, among religious communities tending to adapt their ideas and activities to the changing impulses of the time, were hardly calculated to stimulate zeal, or to make it any easier to discover just what particularly Christianity was, or was about. And to see organized bodies of Christians, under these circumstances, maintaining their existence, with no frightening diminution of membership and formal adherence, might have been likened to the uncorking of a bottle of champagne, which standing open let gradually disperse all of its bubbles. As rather prophetic of this situation, and of what was to grow into a more articulate desire of individuals here and there at least, to find some articulate, definite, and authoritative resting place for their religious faith, a movement of reaction arose before the middle of the nineteenth century, to affect, for a considerable time, few save a number of the clergy of the Anglican communion, but to emphasize, by its later broadening influence, its prophetic character, as one symptom of a growing need.

The movement above referred to, generally known as the "Oxford Reform," had its inception in a variety of different circumstances, some peculiar to England at the period when it took form, some to the particular organization and political situation of the Church of England. Into these particular conditions we cannot enter fully. In the third decade of the eighteenth century England had progressed farther along the political road peculiar to nineteenth-century Europe than any of the other countries, developing without dangerous revolutionary rupture from the Revolution of 1688. Without sacrificing principles, little by little, up to the middle of the nineteenth century, ways and means were arranged of removing practically all religious disabilities, making it impossible for those not members of the Church of England to take part in governing the country. There occurred a number of religious-political squalls, no dangerous storms. The established Church had properties and prerogatives to protect. Its endowments served to provide for many younger sons of gentle birth or noble family, which the law of primogeniture might otherwise have left quite poverty stricken. Country parsons behaved on the whole in no noticeably different way than their lay brothers and cousins. Most schoolmasters, and a large proportion of scholars, were "in orders." In everything but pious zeal the Church behaved well enough. "No church on earth," remarked a contemporary, "has more intrinsic excellence than the English Church, yet no church probably has less practical influence."

In so far as possibilities of reform were concerned, both the political situation of the Church, and the conditions surrounding a large proportion of its property endowments, stood in the way. Bishops were nominally the appointees of the monarch, which made them under the parliamentary régime nominees of the ministry in power when a vacancy fell. Appointment to parish cures was largely a matter of finding some layman with the right to dispose of an ecclesiastical "living" which had descended in his family. The rector of a parish once installed, it was no easy matter to get him out, short of flagrant profligacy or open heresy, the question of which might in last analysis be passed upon by Parliament.

In the midst of this situation the results of the critical study of the Biblical text in Germany began to sift into England. The liberalism of the Church of England previous to this irruption had not been theological, but rather along the line of comfortable tolerance in the matter of conduct. A large proportion of those who enjoyed the incomes from endowments of the Church, hired others at a meager wage to do the work for them, while they spent long periods amusing themselves in London or somewhere on the Continent. Religious life jogged along.

And then came the new intellectual liberalism, "too cold a principle to prevail with the multitude"[1] perhaps, but affecting the attitude of ministers of the crown and even bishops, in such a way as possibly to influence them toward being more lax in the matter of heresy trials. The particular situation of appointments in the Church being as it was, a letting down of the bars as to matters of doctrine might seem to remove almost the sole basis upon which the Church might retain a measure of independence of political and lay control. And so this situation brought to the fore the question as to whether it was consistent with the early traditions of the Catholic Church, and with the writings of the Fathers, for a portion of the Christian community to be subordinated to a government in the way in which Henry VIII had arranged for the subordination of the Church of England.

[1] Newman, *Apologia pro Sua Vita.*

So much for the particular English situation, and the way in which it set a circle of young Oxonians to studying the Church Fathers, translating and editing their works, writing histories of early heresies and schisms, and spreading more broadly their conclusions in a series of "tracts."

But here we scarcely get at the significant center of the movement, which was deeper than this, a reaction of fear, dismay, and energetic defense, against the dissolution of historical doctrines and conceptions which were springing up out of Biblical criticism, and out of other scientific discoveries and speculations. To get at the deep personal note of tragedy in this movement, we may best turn to the personal experience of one of the leaders in this Oxford Reform Movement who, while he does not represent it completely, none the less does represent it in the broadest significant way, and who has moreover left us a long documentary defense and explanation of his religious struggles. This man is John Henry Newman.

Newman's early life and career may be briefly touched. He was born, just at the beginning of the nineteenth century (1801). His father was a banker, of the firm of Ramsbottom Newman and Company; of Dutch extraction, possibly of Hebrew source. As the son of a prosperous banker he went to good schools, where he was soon distinguished for good conduct and scholarship. As an English schoolboy not interested in sports, he was in a sense from the beginning an outsider. He devoted much of his leisure as a schoolboy to reading the Bible and the romances of Walter Scott. At the age of fifteen he had a conversion experience, the remembrance and assurance of which stayed with him throughout his life. He began a little later to ponder upon doctrine, and at sixteen has been described as an evangelical Calvinist. The only part of this condition which need seem strange to us is the technical name—the attitude was much at home in England in those days and later, and its marks have been touched upon many places in preceding pages.

Coincident with this evangelical-Calvinist interest was his arrival at Oxford as a student. He soon won a scholarship, which proved convenient as, during his undergraduate years, his father's bank failed. Of a highly sensitive nature, and zealously desirous of doing well in his final Oxford examinations, he broke down in the middle of them, and received but very moderate honors. However, he remained at Oxford as a private tutor, soon won a fellowship at the most intellectual of the colleges (Oriel), and was destined for some twenty years following the winning of this fellowship to remain under the romantic shadows of Oxford influence.

Ordained a priest of the Church of England in 1824, his parochial experience began at Oxford, as a curate, and continued as vicar of a more important parish, with which was associated a near-by chapel, which became later a sort of retreat in some of his troubled years. Early in his experience as a don he came in contact with the theological liberalism of the period, as associate of one who, as a leader of the movement, was to become an archbishop of the Anglican communion in Ireland (Whatley). Closely following this not altogether successful association he formed a friendship with a fellow tutor at Oxford, who was, as Newman describes him, "a man of high genius, brimful and overflowing with ideas and views, in him original, which were too many and strong even for his bodily strength, and which crowded and jostled against one another in their efforts after distinct shape and expression." This man (J. H. Froude) had taken to browsing generously in a Roman breviary which was a cherished possession of his, and afterwards passed at an important moment into the possession of Newman, as a remembrance at Froude's early death. Froude, in the period of early intimacy with Newman,

> professed openly his admiration of the Church of Rome, and his hatred of the Reformers. He delighted in the notion of an hierarchical system, of sacerdotal power, and of full ecclesiastical liberty. He felt scorn of the maxim, "The Bible and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants"; and he gloried in accepting Tradition as a main instrument of religious teaching. He had a high severe idea of the intrinsic excellence of Virginity; and he consdered the Blessed Virgin its great pattern. He delighted in thinking of the Saints; he had a keen appreciation of the idea of sanctity, its possibility and its heights; and he was more than inclined to

> believe a large amount of miraculous interference as occurring in the early and Middle Ages. He embraced the principle of penance and mortification. He had a deep devotion to the Real Presence, in which he had a firm faith. He was powerfully drawn to the Medieval Church, but not to the Primitive.[2]

He was, in short, if we may believe Newman, in still unformed aspiration, all that this Oxford Movement aimed to lead others to be.

Previous to the year of his meeting with Froude, Newman's life at Oxford had been a rather lonely one. He writes himself of the years 1823 to 1826:

> During the first years of my residence at Oriel [The Oxford College of which he was Fellow] . . . I was not at home there. I was very much alone, and I often used to take my daily walk by myself. . . . As to Dr. Whately himself, he was too much my superior to allow of my being at ease with him; and to no one in Oxford at this time did I open my heart fully and familiarly. But things changed in 1826. At this time I became one of the Tutors of my College, and this gave me position; and besides, I had written one or two essays which had been well received. I began to be known. . . . It was to me like the feeling of spring weather after winter; and, if I may so speak, I came out of my shell; I remained out of it till 1841.[3]

This prominence increased steadily. In 1830 he was asked to write the history of the Nicene Council, which finally appeared under the title *The Arians of the Fourth Century.* What particularly attracted him, in studying to write this work, was "the great Church of Alexandria," in the period when the Neoplatonic philosophy flourished there. The broad philosophy of Clement and Origen, as he says, carried him away, came like music to his inward ear, like the response to long-cherished ideas that had found little outward encouragement. "Nature was a parable; Scripture was an allegory; pagan literature, philosophy, and mythology, properly understood, were but a preparation for the Gospel."[4] To this school he owed what he "definitely held about the Angels." In a sermon in 1834 he stated, "Every breath of air and ray of light, every beautiful prospect, is, as it were, the skirts of their garments, the waving of the robes of those whose faces see God."[5]

---

[2] *Ibid.,* 73, 74, 3rd ed.

[3] *Ibid.,* 66.

[4] *Apologia,* 75.

Such poetic phraseology in sermons offended no one. Newman's literary gifts were winning wider recognition, as they were later to place him among the acknowledged nineteenth-century masters of English prose. But, in intimate conversation, he might apply the doctrine of angels politically.

> Daniel speaks as if each nation had its guardian angel. . . . Take England, with many high virtues, and yet a low Catholicism. It seems to me that John Bull is a spirit neither of heaven nor hell.[6] . . . The Whigs had come into power; Lord Grey had told the Bishops to set their house in order. . . . The vital question was how . . . to keep the Church from being liberalized. . . . The Bishop of London . . . had been for years engaged in diluting the high orthodoxy of the Church by the introduction of the Evangelical body into places of influence and trust.[7]

Newman began to compare this "divided and threatened" Church with what he saw of fresh vigorous power in the first centuries. He went to the south of Europe with Froude and the latter's father. Thinking of England when he had looked upon Gibraltar he wrote:

Tyre of the West, and glorying in the name
   More than in Faith's pure fame!
O trust not crafty fort nor rock renown'd
   Earn'd upon hostile ground;
Wielding Trade's master-keys, at thy proud will
To lock or loose its waters, England! trust not still.

He who scann'd Sodom for his righteous men
   Still spares thee for thy ten;
But, should vain tongues the Bride of Heaven defy
   He will not pass thee by. . . .[8]

The banker's son is expecting the judgment of God upon his country, which had been called a "nation of shopkeepers." He had never seen much of Roman Catholicism near-by. He begins to see its monuments, not quite approving, yet touched. Froude is convinced that an established church, under the wing of some government, is no church at all. Newman is worried in many ways about the Church of England. He writes in Malta at Christmas:

---

[5] *Ibid.*, 77.
[6] *Ibid.*, 78.
[7] *Ibid.*, 79.
[8] "England" in the *Lyra Apostolica.*

O Britons! now so brave and high,
  How will ye weep the day
When Christ in judgment passes by,
  And calls the Bride away! [9]

After a fit of illness which decided him to return to England, he was obliged to remain three weeks at Palermo in Sicily. He calmed his impatience by visiting the churches there. He does not tell us how they impressed him.[10] Sailing thence for Marseilles he was becalmed in the strait between Corsica and Sardinia. He expresses his state of mind at that time in what is doubtless his best-known poem:

Lead kindly light, amid the encircling gloom,
  Lead Thou me on!
The night is dark, and I am far from home—
  Lead Thou me on!
Keep thou my feet; I do not ask to see
The distant scene,—one step enough for me.

I was not ever thus, nor pray'd that Thou
  Shouldst lead me on.
I loved to choose and see my path, but now
  Lead Thou me on!—

. . . . .

And with the morn those angel faces smile
Which I have loved long since, and lost awhile.[11]

---

[9] "Christmas without Christ," *Lyra Apostolica.*

[10] There is however a poem of interest from this stay in Palermo:
"Oh that thy creed were sound!
  For thou dost soothe the heart, thou Church of Rome,
By thy unwearied watch and varied round
  Of service, in thy Saviour's holy home."
*The Good Samaratan.*

[11] Published under the title, "The Pillar and the Cloud," in *Lyra Apostolica.*

As one looks back it is plain to see the direction in which Newman was being carried. We cannot tarry to count the steps, for the progress was slow. He was convinced that a church was part of God's divine plan as revealed in Christ. He began to look over the Church of England for marks of authentic union with that church, taking apparently as one of his guides at least, the Jesuit father, Bellarmine. More and more he felt certain that his salvation, and that of everyone who looked for salvation as a Christian, was bound up with membership in this church. And for his own Church of England he began to fear, not only with Froude that the State would help it slip into liberalism and infidelity, but even worse: that even in its own theological basis, the forging of seventeenth-century divines of hallowed memory, it was heretical, save where some of these theologians were, he believed, closer to Rome than the Anglican interpreters had ever allowed of them.

He became less and less sure that Rome was wrong, and where he could not yet allow himself to believe she was right, he began to discover that some things which Rome allowed in practice, she did not hold officially as doctrine. Concentrating upon the things she held officially as doctrine, it soon came to be for him less a question of where Rome was wrong than a question as to how near the Church of England was, or was not, to Rome. With the assistance of Walter Scott and his friend Froude, he formed a vision of the Middle Ages, and its powerful popes, who anathemetized emperors and excommunicated kings. He had read thousands of pages of the Church Fathers, studied the history of several heresies. Always, through the works of these Fathers, and through the struggles against these heresies, he saw a certain institution coming to be in more clear and august form, overshadowing with unquestioned and beneficent sway the whole of Europe. He did not see anywhere else in Christendom such a Church as that—not at all to be wondered at to be sure, since no one imagined that there ever had been any other. And, if that was just the sort of an institution which saved men in eternity, it was indeed a mere matter of rudimentary logic to show that this church was the only door by which one might hope to enter heaven. Its position had been fortified, step by step, with *ex post facto* logic. No other Christian community was built up with the same logic, if for no other reason, no other Christian community had been built upon the same premises. The premises of his own Church of England were, despite all his trying, plainly different. About the best which could be said for it, from the point of view at which he had arrived, was that it claimed for its doctrines Scriptural validity, and for its bishops an apostolic succession as valid as that of the Roman bishops themselves. But, when it came to the matter of what the Church of England had rejected, of medieval doctrine and practice, it was by no means clear to say what and why and where things were rejected; since rejection had never been based on any clear theory, but rather, it had slipped from politically inspired schism into Protestantism, on the basis of strong prejudice against certain aspects of Roman power, and strong reaction against practices, some of which the Roman Church in the Council of Trent had in theory, so far as direct pronouncement was concerned, left behind. All the later sixteenth-century and seventeenth-century Anglican theology was in a sense an afterthought, and all too plainly an afterthought not built at all upon Roman premises.

And so, in the end, and after more than ten years of struggle and continual slipping, Newman was forced to take the painful step of leaving the church in which he had labored—even more painful, the leaving of the university in which, as he himself admits, he had labored more than in the parochial community put in his charge. "On the twenty-third [of February, 1846] I left the Observatory. I have never seen Oxford since, excepting its spires, as they are seen from the railway."[12]

From then until his death, in 1890, at the age of eighty-nine, Newman's life belongs to the Roman Catholic Church, which church made him, in his seventy-ninth year, a cardinal. Subsequent to this event he never published any written work save the preface to the book of a friend, a dignitary of the Church of England, and a magazine article on Biblical criticism.

---

[12] *Apologia,* 263 (Newman did, as a matter of fact, after an absence of thirty-two years, return with honor to Oxford, as a Fellow of Trinity College. He was, however, nearing his eightieth year when this honor arrived.

Newman's happiness in the Roman Church, when once the important step had been made, has been a matter of controversy, which is of necessity largely a question of interpretation, since it was not likely to be a subject upon which he expressed himself. About all that can be said is that he met, in his career as priest of this church, a number of disappointments, and his recognition, as a member of the College of Cardinals, came in the late evening of a life which had never been, in his new church, of the prominent distinction he had for a time enjoyed in the Church of England. Two statements, however, may be hazarded: one, that Newman was of a temperament such that this neglect could not but have hurt; the other that hardly anyone would suspect that ambition had any rôle to play among the forces which led him to Rome.

As the nineteenth century opened the Middle Ages began to draw a considerable measure of romantic admiration from many susceptible souls, and along with this no small measure of longing for the picturesque surroundings of medieval religion. But deeper than this, as old certainties were disturbed by science, and by Biblical criticism, there were yearnings for the certain hope of salvation which authoritative religion had for centuries held out; which it seemed impossible to satisfy outside that church which had always enunciated, from the beginning of its history, a message of certain assurance, more and more definitely, as the ages past, through the mouth of a single person—the Bishop of Rome, and pope of the Middle Ages. It is this mood, this yearning desire to repose in a faith such as the Middle Ages were assumed to have possessed, for which Cardinal Newman stands, and for which he will doubtless even more clearly and definitely stand, when history leaves this movement farther behind, to hang its laurels upon a very few prominent monuments.

# LXVII

Securus judicat orbis terrarum.[1]

He who has seen a ghost, cannot
be as if he had never seen it.[2]

It was suggested, in the preceding chapter, that one should not assume, on the basis of any disquieting tendencies noted in the Christian world, that its institutions mirrored in any disquieting way this troubling situation. Outside the Roman Church, the Church of England best exemplified the situation, harboring at once those who had not gone quite as far toward Rome as Newman, and some who had gone quite as far as the most radical Biblical critics in the opposite direction. But what of Rome, still standing with untroubled authority, as Newman believed her to stand, even as in the days of Augustine?

It has become our final task to glance at the history of the Roman Church during the nineteenth century. No chapter of nineteenth-century history is more full of dramatic incident, if it be traced, as we must attempt largely to trace it, at its capital and center—Rome.

This historic Church, slowly built through the Middle Ages in the Gothic style, somewhat pruned and chastened architecturally in the Counter Reformation, was to bear the full brunt of movements we have been sketching in earlier chapters of this book, dealing with religion in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The end of the story is perhaps not yet. The many complications of the story, too, pass into the field of manifold types of individual religious experience and need, into which we cannot follow it. The theme is knit up with memories and habits, the depths and permanence of which cannot be adequately measured, among persons of every social class, many nationalities. It is knit up with centuries of history. No human institution makes such pretentious claims to universal significance, and no European institution even attempts to carry so much of its history along with it.

---

[1] The Universal judgment is safe.

[2] Newman, *Apologia,* 158.

Nor are these claims but empty, these attempts merely vain. One may even hazard the statement that no type of religious attitude or behavior which European religious experience has turned up during centuries fails altogether to find a place, and a manner of attaching itself to, this "universal" Church; and that very often, where it might fail to convince by its *present,* it is just this historic *past,* which it often seems so laboriously to carry with it, which wins and holds allegiance.

Let us, therefore, renounce at once the hope of adequately picturing here the Roman Catholic Church in the nineteenth century, or even in those first three quarters of this century to which roughly we have attempted to limit all of our study. Newman says of the Church of Rome, "She alone, amid all the errors and evils of her practical system, has given free scope to the feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness, and other feelings which may be especially called Catholic."[3] Another statement, which concerns more particularly her monasticism, emphasizes another pole of the situation:

> The idyllic life of the monk, a life of prayer, and toil, and unworldliness or other-worldliness, does not exist to any great extent outside the pages of Catholic apologists and a few non-Catholic poets and novelists. The form of monasticism remains, but the spirit is almost gone from it. . . . Not that monasticism, apart from its high profession, is an object of special moral reprobation; its fault, its title of contempt, lies rather in its continued profession of an ideal from which it has hopelessly fallen, and in its constant effort to hide that discrepancy.[4]

It is part of the interest of these two quotations to note that the former is from the pen of one who was about to flee to the refuge of the historic Roman Church, the latter that of one who

[3] *Apologia,* 204.

[4] McCabe, *Twelve Years in a Monastery,* chap. xii.

had fled from it, and from its institution of monasticism. One represents aspiration, the other disillusion. Both are conscious of the fact that this Roman Church was at one and the same time two things—a rich and revered symbol, which had gathered in religious aspiration through all the periods of Christianity's struggles; a human institution which was less than any other excused its faults and shortcomings, because of its lofty pretensions.

But the Roman Church, just as any other Christian body, was and is still a third thing: a vast reservoir in which are molten the emotional contents of countless personal religious experiences. These we cannot here hope to touch or even hint at. We cannot even attempt to follow all the various means and activities by which these purely personal elements were, in the period that interests us, drawn together in many interlocking complexes. We shall be contemplating, in the paragraphs to follow, merely the broadest corporate gestures of the institution, reacting as a whole through its authoritative central organ, to the immediate forces of the time in which we are to regard its actions and sanctions.

A recent author has described the coronation procession of Clement XIV, that pope who was, as a consequence of persistent pressure on the part of Bourbon monarchs particularly, obliged to disperse the Jesuit Company. He is the last pope significantly connected with the old régime. Rome was still papal Rome, and after but a few years never again to be so completely so.

An immense crowd pressed upon the barriers along the way from the papal palace (now that of the King of Italy) to the *Mother Church of all the churches, and head of the world*: the Basilica of St. John of the Lateran. Bedecked and bepowdered women were framed in windows gay with banners and with precious tapestries hung from the balustrades. A long and brilliant *cortège* passed—a squadron of lancers, four knights of the papal guard, lay nobles of the papal household, squires and footmen of the cardinals, ten high-stepping horses drawing the papal litter, trumpeters, gentlemen-in-waiting, the Swiss Guard, ambassadors. Finally, preceded by three masters-of-ceremony mounted and an important prelate, the pope himself. His robes were rich, bordered with ermine. His stole was of cloth of gold. The horse he rode was more richly caparisoned than any that had preceded. Behind him two prelates raised above his head the papal umbrella. His chief gentleman-in-waiting led a mule, to remind the bystanders, doubtless, that Jesus had, on an important occasion, ridden through the streets of Jerusalem upon one, and he might also, if he wished. Pages followed, fifteen cardinals upon mules, the papal carriage—litter, horse, mule or carriage: the pope had, considering the period, a broad choice of means of locomotion.[5]

Upon such festive ceremonies Rome, through a long succession of centuries, had become accustomed to live. The population, which had perhaps reached a million in the days of ancient Rome, had with various ups and downs sunk to some hundred and fifty thousand. It might almost be said that this population lived upon the pope. How live otherwise? The surrounding country was far from rich agriculturally; active commerce was impossible—no important products in which to trade, a Tiber not navigable, a near-by port of little importance, and the roads by which traffic must travel infested with bandits. Industry? Yes: violin strings and piano wire were manufactured, so were false pearls and imitation jewelry, cheap art reproductions, pious images, ostentatious bookbindings, mosaics, engravings, pictures painted upon sea shells, in some seven hundred workshops and tenement chambers.[6]

Of the hundred and fifty thousand population, at least thirty thousand were direct papal functionaries of one sort or another and their dependents. There were probably more than ten thousand monks, clergy, seminarians, etc. A considerable portion of the population lived upon bounties of bread distributed by monasteries. How many were those indirect mendicants who lived, in one way or another, upon the pilgrims and curious gathering there from every part of Europe? How many sorts of coinage drifted in tribute of some sort to Rome? What were the profits of the money changers? Rome had also its Ghetto. St. Peter had been a Jew, and nowhere in Europe had his countrymen lived more untroubled for centuries.

---

[5] Hayward, *Le Dernier Siècle de la Rome Pontifical,* I, 18ff.
[6] Madelin, *La Rome de Napoléon,* chap. i.

Then there was the aristocracy, living upon two sources of income: lands in the surrounding countryside, and incomes derived from the fact that these families were almost all of them represented in the College of Cardinals, and that few of them had not, at some time or another, produced a pope. Then there was the papal army—a pathetic little army Napoleon's officials found it when they came to rule there. There were the police. In a dozen years, before and after 1800, one hundred and five persons were hanged, some for crimes as petty as stealing a pair of boots or a bundle of vegetables, although Rome was the one corner of Europe where the criminal could count upon going unpunished nine times out of ten, and there was one hospital open especially for victims of assassination.[7]

It was a gay and carefree population, which gathered in groups, in various cafés, to repeat or discuss the latest scurrilous witticism (*pasquinata*), not seldom directed at the pope himself, posted on the pedestal of an antique statue at a prominent corner; and which never long forgot that Rome had been founded by Æneas, the son of Venus. It was a population with two occasional universal interests, the publication of winning numbers in the papal lottery, and the celebration of the carnival; and one persistent interest, fitting various ways into all the rest, religion.

Holy Week arrived, the whole population suddenly assumed an altered aspect. Good Friday everyone, Jews excepted, contemplated the mystery of the Passion, and perhaps the sins they had laid aside for the week.

> The streets are no longer obstructed by dancers, or by groups given over to some coarse amusement. . . . Full of modesty and respect which are the marks of penitence, even the freest of the weaker sex seem this day to have taken no care to make themselves attractive. They wear black dresses without ornament, no jewelry, no flowers at the corsage. Beneath the thin lace of mourning shine large medals of piety. Women

---

[7] *Ibid.*, 65-67.

> abandon their favorites, men their licentious habits. . . . Chastened by scruples, the young love-lorn are economical of languishing glances. The widow sighs, "Oh, traitor love! Dear Husband, whose memory I cherish rest in peace!" Pious old women, with yellow faces, expiate with prayers old faults. The bachelors, deprived of pleasures . . . weep over sins they have committed, loosing their imaginations toward still unsatisfied desires. . . . People of every sort of birth, of every social class, melted together, go all to cast themselves at the feet of some priest. Careless of their titles, without trace of haughtiness, mingled in one holy and apostolic equality, they beat their breasts, confused and dumb; alike those vowed to religion and the frankly dissolute. Who could describe the varied psychology of these penitents? [8]

The popes governed these people—popes in rather quick succession, since when chosen they were likely to be old men. None knew these popes as did the Roman citizenry; none were so swift to discover and to flay a weakness, or even a physical decrepitude or misfortune, pitilessly.

> He is covered with erysipelas, toothless, crossed-eyed, and he drags his feet! His body is crooked, and the Devil will have a hand in it, if he live long enough to enrich his family.[9]

But it is a mistake to judge from this that these Romans were discontented, either with their rulers or their rule. Justice operated a little like the Virgin of the Middle Ages. If in danger from the clutches of the law, one never knew how or from whence pardon, more general amnesty, or mere removal of his case from one court to another, might bear him *indulgence* from judicial punishment. Above everything else these Romans knew that they were Romans, and that for centuries, under Roman emperors and Christian popes, Rome had been set apart from and above all European cities. As ancient Rome had never looked upon her emperors precisely as other parts of the empire, obliging the imperial cult to take in the capital a different form than elsewhere, so at Rome the pope was not precisely the same figure as elsewhere in Christendom. But, if they might see a little clearer than others underneath papal robes of state, that was in a measure because they felt themselves a little underneath these same robes themselves, and sharers of their splendor. The pope was in a particular way theirs, and they were his, in a particular way. His human blemishes were a family affair, and might be ridiculed and discussed as such. But this by no means meant that they less regarded things he stood for to everybody generally, or the particular daily matters of pecuniary importance or occasional diversion he meant particularly to them.

---

[8] Quoted from a contemporary social commentator, Giovanni Giraud, by Hayward, II, 127-129.

[9] Giuseppe-Gioacchino Belli, written of Pope Leo XII.

It is worth our while to have dwelt some moments upon Rome and Romans at the time of the coronation of Clement XIV, for this was, in many important respects, very much Rome as Rome had been for more than a thousand years.

But this Rome was soon to be pushed into the middle of currents which were to leave her greatly changed. The ideas of the French Revolution penetrated to a mild extent, even brought about a sudden and evanescent revolution. But it was to take more than the philosophies of the Age of Reason to do more than affect surface currents, such as indeed had always agitated the city from time to time. The real change was to begin with Napoleon.

The trailing end of the Revolution stripped Rome of several temporal provinces, but immediately afterwards the determination of the emperor to *use* the Church held out a new, even though not altogether satisfactory, promise. The Concordat, of which we have already noted the preface, was signed. It was at least a great improvement over the situation of the Revolution, and its basis was after all the religious-political arrangement which had existed since that settled between Leo X and Francis I. Then followed the journey of Pius VII to France, for the coronation of the emperor. At the culminating moment this was, to be sure, a disappointment, since the emperor suddenly took from the hands of the doubtless astonished Leo, the imperial crown, and put it upon his head himself. The symbolism of Charlemagne's crowning, with all the resulting controversy of centuries, had been departed from significantly.

However, the pope derived prestige of another sort from this expedition. After the troubling days of the Revolution, and after the humiliations of the papal see itself, it was consoling both to the people and to the successor of Peter, that he should pass, as he himself wrote of this journey through France, in the midst of populations upon their knees. A new chapter for the papacy had in a sense been inaugurated: that of the popular influence of the pope.

But the future was still full of political embarrassments, far more serious than those immediately behind. By 1808 Napoleon's political program had become more definite and more ambitious. A pope was all very well, in so far as the usefulness of religion to him was concerned, but as for Rome, the vision of Napoleon was directed, not toward its papal, but toward its preceding republican glories, passing into imperial splendors. Not for nothing had Napoleon matured along with and sympathetic to the French enlightenment, fed upon dreams of ancient Roman freedom and glory. The torch of liberty had passed to France. Carrying it, a new emperor would one day come to Rome, bearing to her the institutions of the new order of free enlightenment—the Code Napoleon, French prefects, French lycées. It was decided, finally decreed, that Rome should be freed from papal rule.

Early in 1808 a French army "stopped" in Rome, *en route* ostensibly for Naples. It continued to stop. The emperor had issued his decree, and it had been countered by a bull of excommunication, of severity, however, far more moderate than medieval tradition, enjoining obedience and submission upon subjects of the emperor, and clouding with a certain uncertainty at least the question as to whether the emperor himself were directly attainted.[10] For eighteen months the city enjoyed a double government, papal in theory, French in fact. Always it became clearer that, with the people, the authority of the pope was "more absolute than ever."[11] Civic Roman pride played a large part; fear of seeing their city "united to a state in which it would count but as a secondary city."[12] The opposition to French occupation, though passive and orderly, was stubborn. The prominent aristocracy avoided attendance at brilliant parties given by the French general. Even the carnival was a blank failure. In groups and one by one the College of Cardinals was scattered, the papal governor was exiled, then the papal secretary of state. Every step but increased resistance, all the more difficult to counter because proceeding from an unarmed prisoner.

---

[10] This question was important, as also the vagueness of general terms, since a congregation approved by Pius VII declared that those excommunicates not particularly named were not necessarily to be "avoided" by the faithful. De Mayol de Lupe, *La Capitivité de Pie VII,* I, 151. See also I, 392, and footnote.

It did seem that the appearance of the emperor himself might have helped matters, and yet the theatrical moment for his arrival did not put in appearance. Instead, on the day that the papal standard was finally pulled down, and with it the pretense of papal rule, there came a proclamation:

> Romans, the will of the greatest of heroes unites you to the greatest of States. It was fitting that the earth's foremost people should share the benefit of its laws, and the honor of its name, with those who, in another age, had preceded them upon the way of conquest. . . . In associating you with his empire, Napoleon the Great has desired only to give you, after so many centuries of oblivion, a lot more worthy of your ancient destinies. . . . United to France, you are to-day strong through her; the evils due to your weakness have come to an end.

It would have been difficult to word a proclamation more offensive to Roman ears. The combined glory of Napoleon and the Age of Reason was a little blinding.

Finally, in the dead of night, it became necessary to kidnap Pius VII, after the most careful preparations to have it done without disturbing the public. Whether or not the emperor really wished this is uncertain. He had at least given orders permitting it as a last resort, and the disconcerting firmness, under the frail and timid body of a monk, seemed to make it necessary. Pius was again given opportunity to renounce his claim to temporal rule. "We cannot renounce what is not ours," he replied. "The

[11] Letter of Lefebvre, Napoleon's diplomatic representative, Madelin, 185.

[12] Report of M. Alquier, successor of Lefebvre quoted above.

emperor may hew us in pieces, but that he will not obtain from us." Then followed a hurried journey up through Italy, across the Alps, to Grenoble. Upon the way, in spite of precautions, here and there the passage of the pope became known, crowds gathered for his blessing. Arrived at Grenoble there came finally orders to return him to Italy, this time to territory firmly under French control, to Savona, a small but ancient city on the Gulf of Genoa. Here again a constant campaign went on, to urge him to renounce his temporal claims, and leave Rome to be peaceably governed as a part of the great empire. Departing for Russia, Napoleon thought Pius safer in Fontainebleau, and the place of exile was changed.

We cannot follow the long struggle which meanwhile went on in Rome, to *refound* a Rome which had never existed, save in the imagination of some eighteenth-century men of letters such as Montesquieu. Great sums were spent in beautifying the city. The pope's empty palace was elaborately renovated, apparently in preparation for the time when the emperor would finally arrive in triumph. The moment never came. Napoleon grew more and more vexed, more and more brutal, to see his dream frustrated by a mere remaining handful of monks and priests. Then Murat, galloping to Italy after Napoleon's defeat at Leipzig, set in motion a treasonable attempt against his brother-in-law. Against this, at least, the emperor knew the one successful card to play. Pius VII returned to Rome.

"The news of the pope's return voyage made the entire city delirious with joy." Murat's Neapolitan troops were now tolerated merely as a provisional garrison; his power melted away. The pope approached, but ere his carriage reached the city gates the horses were unhitched. Young people of the first families dragged it in and through the streets, between cheering crowds which the Neapolitan troops which lined the way as a hedge could not keep back; dragged it to the portico of the Quirinal, which had long been undergoing sumptuous alterations, in expectation of receiving the emperor.

Such was the fate of the *Aufklärung,* meeting historic Christendom's ultimate stronghold. The result leaves room for reflection far too easily dismissed by an eighteenth-century poet's words, "Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise." Yet ignorance played its part. The ignorance of Rome, its nobles, populace, lower clergy and monks, had been matter of common comment for centuries. And in the eighteenth century the value of ignorance in maintaining docile parishioners was not unappreciated.

> Having examined the matter very closely, I find, and my colleagues find, that the largest number of those parishioners we have which are the least Christian, is made up of those who have gone to school; and that all those who are the most simple, the most innocent, the most Christian, neither know how to read nor to write.[18]

Far more complex, however, was the entire problem, as was also the problem of reason more complex than dreams of a Napoleon. And while new ideas might be rejected, improvements of a material and economic nature inaugurated under the French régime left an influence. Though opposed by a pope, after railways had come to connect many other important cities, one finally reached Rome, and was found an advantage by the citizens, as more pilgrims and strangers than ever before came there.

But, along with such changes, the vicissitudes of the papacy were by no means ended. In 1846, Giovanni Maria Mastai-Ferretti, Bishop of Imola, was chosen pope by the conclave of cardinals, taking the name Pius IX. Meanwhile, since the death of Pius VII, the intervening popes had been of such sort as might have been expected in the period of reaction following the overthrow of Napoleon. Leo XII and Pius VIII had been almost servile at the feet of Austria, a growing tyrant in Italy. Gregory XVI detested all changes of his century, and regarded the education of the common people as an unmixed evil. But, further than this, he laxly permitted the plundering of the public funds, and set bars against commerce and industry, enthusiasm for which had begun to awaken even in Rome. Books, even when forbidden by the *Index,* and an increasing number of strangers, began to circulate new political, economic, and social ideas, by now freely discussed in most of Europe. And in consequence of the narrow reaction of Gregory, the conclave assembled following his death was split into two factions, one narrowly reactionary, the other more liberal. As often happens in such cases, even apart from ecclesiastical spheres, both sides finally got together upon a candidate of obscurity and flexibility such that each side felt he might in the end serve their interests. This in a sense he did, though consecutively.

---

[18] Quoted from Reguis, *La voix du pasteur* (1773), by Groethuysen, *Origin de l'Esprit Bourgeois en France, 9.*

Mastai, after an initial clerical education, entered military service. At nineteen he was serving in the *gardes d'honneur* instituted by Napoleon as a picked corps kept near his person. He became a lieutenant, and after the fall of the emperor he entered the army of Austria. He developed apparently a mild epilepsy, and believing himself to have been miraculously cured, he became a priest,[14] dispensing with broadcast generosity his considerable patrimony. We need not follow his career before arriving at the summit of Catholic Christendom. It was to be, in his time, a precarious position. He had managed very well with his diocese as a bishop. Perhaps the best that can be said for him is that, while accessible to many influences, he was in the end incapable of facing the difficulties of treading an untrodden road. An Italian who lived through this period in prominent rôles has said of him, "Frank measures frightened him; he lacked courage and audacity. Not only did he lack the elevation of character for the rôle offered him to play, but the events which marked his reign dominated him."[15] Events made of him a sort of a saint, among the appraisals of whose character one may in a measure choose.

These events had begun long before his papacy, in revolts, generally over all Italy, against Austrian rule and the tyranny of other princes. Shortly after his elevation the revolutionary movements broke out again, and now as the beginning of a determined effort to unify Italy. In January, 1848, the poet and liberal politi-

[14] So says the Abbé Villefranche, *Vie de Pie IX.* There was a story that the renunciation of a military career resulted from an unhappy love affair.

[15] Cesar Vimercati, *Histoire de l'Italie, 1848-1849* (1860), I, 64.

cal leader Lamartine announced in the French Chamber of Deputies that it was the duty of Pius IX to constitute a free and federated Italy.

Pius IX indeed inaugurated his papacy with many political reforms in the Papal States and in Rome, of general intention to shift the government from clerical to lay hands. When revolution broke out armies and citizenry adopted as the war cry, *"Viva l'Italia! Viva Pio Nono!"* Suddenly he turned right-about before radical tendencies developing in Rome, and before strong Austrian influence brought to bear. Then a local revolution drove him in flight from his capital. Both France and Austria were eager to arrange a refuge. Perhaps by a ruse of which he was ignorant, perhaps because of a sudden change of mind, instead of going as the French had planned, aboard an English man-of-war waiting for him, he landed in Gaëta, in the Kingdom of Naples, one of the obstacles to Italian freedom. A French army later returned him to Rome, and stayed to protect him there, even while allied with Piedmontese who desired more and more to make Rome the capital of Italy.

All liberal tendencies had disappeared when Pius IX returned to Rome. Not only was the old régime reinstated, but many acts of vengeance were perpetrated against those who had taken part in the movement from which he fled. None the less Rome had changed, and the position of the pope in Rome, his power resting now upon the army of Napoleon III, had changed. For one thing Rome, its high society and its bourgeois, had become vastly more cosmopolitan. Life became gay again, while elsewhere in Italy all was disorder. The Church enjoyed at least enough prosperity for a papal secretary of state, of poor and humble birth, to die leaving a fortune of some 100,000,000 lire, to a woman who succeeded in establishing her claim to the estate as a daughter.

But, to balance this loss of political prestige, already apparent, something else was happening. "The saintly popularity of the papacy," wrote the Rector of the Catholic University of Lille in 1902, "is the new characteristic phenomenon inaugurated by the pontificate of Pius IX."[16] France, while the most troublesome, still always perhaps none the less the most effective papal standby through the stretch of centuries, was now more unified in its Catholicism than it had been for several centuries. Austria and Spain were soon to rank definitely as strongholds where political reaction longest stood siege. The very weakening of political influence in the various states of Catholic population predominantly, threw back the bishops with less divided loyalty upon the papacy. Catholicism entire, where it remained most an influence, was drawing more closely about the pope than it had been for long; even while the blow was preparing which was to strip him of his temporal power, shut him up a voluntary prisoner in the Vatican, to add a martyrdom of a sort to his other elements of growing popular prestige.

This movement did not overtake Pius. Perhaps he felt the pulse? Certainly he possessed a considerable measure of personal pride which needed some repairing after his ignominious flight, and scarcely altogether satisfactory return. Together with events bringing growing political weakness, the boldest steps leading to the assertion of dogmatic and intellectual authority were taken. In 1854 the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, subject of controversy in the Church since the Middle Ages, was finally declared an official dogma which the faithful were required to believe. Not only this, but the dogma was promulgated by Pius himself, no council, as even as late as the time of that of Trent, assisting.

Other more important things were still to come. In 1861, Pius issued an *allocation,* on the subject of whether the Roman Pontiff should stretch out a friendly hand to contemporary civilization:

> As for those who invite us, for the good of religion, to tender our hand to modern civilization, we ask ourselves whether, in presence of the facts of which we are witness, he whom Christ himself established as his Vicar upon earth . . . can, without gravely wounding his conscience, without becoming an object of scandal, make alliance with modern civilization. . . . It allows all liberty to those who, by their

---

[16] Baunard, *Un Siècle de l'Église en France,* 103.

> words and writings, attack the Church and men devoted to its cause; and thus it inspires, nourishes, and foments license. . . . But if one understands by civilization a system put together expressly to weaken and perhaps overturn the Church of Christ, it is certain that neither the Holy See nor the Roman Pontiff could come to an understanding with that civilization.[17]

Such words are carefully chosen, and make perhaps the mistake of imputing to a civilization as an intention, what is merely a possibility left—as always such possibilities ultimately have been left—with the dominant element of the civilization itself. But the whole question of what, among the questions raised during centuries of thought about religion and this Church, was definitely condemned, was to be somewhat further clarified. Three years later came an encyclical upon the general question of modern civilization, together with a syllabus, or outline of condemned opinions. As one runs the propositions of this syllabus through, it does not appear that any argument, whether against the temporal or spiritual supremacy of the popes, from the Middle Ages to the mid-nineteenth century, has failed of condemnation.

The form was, of course, most cleverly chosen, since it is likely to be on the whole even easier to refute propositions drawn for the purpose of refuting them, than to defend those drawn with the intention of defending them. We need but note a very few, of particular modern emphasis, remembering that they are *condemned propositions!*

> LV—The Church should be separate from the State, and the State separate from the Church.
>
> LXXIII—What is properly speaking a marriage may exist between Christians, in virtue of a purely civil contract; and it is false to state that a marriage contracted between Christians is always a sacrament, or that the contract is nullified if the sacrament is excluded.
>
> LXXIV—The matter of marriage and engagement of marriage belong, by their nature to the civil jurisdiction.
>
> LXXVI—The abrogation of civil sovereignty, of which the Holy See is in possession, would even prove of great advantage to the liberty and prosperity of the Church.

---

[17] Quoted in abstraction from a French translation, 341-342, in Materne, *Le Syllabus Pontifical, etc.,* par M. L'Abbé Leonard Falconi.

LXXVII—In the age in which we live it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion be considered as the sole religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other cults.

LXXX—[And last] The Roman Pontiff can and should reconcile himself with and come to terms with progress, liberalism, and modern civilization.[18]

Steps toward Italian unity meanwhile made great strides. By the time that the empire of Napoleon III fell in 1871, Victor Immanuel of the House of Savoy had practically all of Italy save Rome gathered together under his banner. The troops of France soon to be obliged to withdraw, the army of the new king of Italy outside the walls, the last step in the program of Pius IX was made. In July, 1870, less than three months before the Roman citizenry declared by overwhelming majority allegiance to the new kingdom, Pius announced that the pope, when speaking *ex cathedra* concerning a matter of the Faith, was so inspired as to make his judgment infallible.

The relation to this process of determined defense to the experience and psychology of Pius IX we need not here try to fathom. It meant, however, something else. It meant that the papacy, about to cease as one of the temporal powers of Europe, was relying now as never before upon its united religious flock, of every class, nation, and caste of religious belief or practice. It meant also that now at last, as Pius VII threatened to do, rather than accept a pension from Napoleon, the papacy was to rely almost entirely, and more and more, for its financial support, upon more or less freely offered gifts of its lay flock. It is at least said that, early in the pontificate of Leo XIII, attempts to increase the fortunes of the Vatican by speculation rendered the financial situation for a time even more precarious, and at all events, the papacy had a new sort of financial situation to meet, almost contemporaneous with this increase of spiritual pretension. Here again, the Curia must count upon its united human resources, big and little. The popular appeal of the papacy was to be not only its great opportunity, but its temptation doubtless as well.

---

[18] Translated from Materne edition.

If there ever had been a time for centuries, when the Roman Church seemed in need of miraculous attestation to the miraculous claims it was now definitely thundering against all the tendencies of its age, it does seem that these last fifteen years of papal temporal power might have been particularly chosen by divine wisdom. And the miracle was to come—one came indeed beforehand, in the year 1858, in an obscure village among the foothills of the Pyrenees.

> The little town of Lourdes, awake and smiling, its feet in the *Gave,* its head lying softly against the foothills of the Pyrenees, has always been a city of beggars. In the feudal age it belonged to armed and terrible beggars, lords of its castle, who came down from its rocky defense to take in the plain whatever others did not choose to give voluntarily. Later, Lourdes was the crossroads of routes leading to the watering-places of the Pyrenees. Diligences, post-chaises, private carriages changed horses here, while the occupants lunched. The parents lived on the passing strangers, and the children had the habit of running after the carriage, demanding a trifling gift.[19]

A charming spot it must have been in those days, its castle picturesquely perched upon a small hill, seemingly set for the purpose in the midst of a valley with narrow openings; a sweep of green meadow along the edge of the gay, clear stream, as one approached the village ascending.

In this little town died, in 1841, a citizen of very modest competence, leaving a widow, four daughters and a mill. The eldest daughter was already married. A husband must be found for the second, that there might be a man to run the mill. The choice was apparently not fortunate, and even the apologist admits that the family of Louise Casterot hardly considered François Soubirous, an advantageous match.[20] His family was run down, he himself apparently an alcoholic, arrested but a little before the important events to follow, for the theft of a bit of wood.[21] "Under the new millers," writes one who is presented as a witness of the events, "the revenues of the *Moulin de Boly* began to decrease." Meanwhile the family rapidly increased from two to six. By 1854 all the savings were gone, the rental of the mill could no longer be paid, they moved out and began to seek work as itinerant day workers. When rent day came they could not pay, finally were allowed to live rent free in the tumbled-down and unrentable shack of some relative.[22]

---

[19] De Bonnefon, *Lourdes et ses Tenanciers,* 3.

[20] J. B. Estrade, *Les Apparitions de Lourdes, Souvenirs intimes d'un témoin,* Lourdes, Imprimerie de la Grotte, 19.

[21] *Ibid.,* 125.

The eldest of their children was a daughter, Bernadette. She was born weak and sickly, soon manifested the symptoms of asthma. Her weakness made her a special subject of care to the parents, and aroused jealousy among the other children.[23] One winter an aunt took her in during the cold months, then again she went off a while to conduct to pasture their tiny flock of sheep for some poor peasants. During this stay the parish priest discovered that, although now in her fourteenth year, no one had yet spoken to her of preparing to make her first communion. The woman with whom she lived as shepherdess took her in hand evenings, finding her very difficult to teach. "You will never be anything but a fool and an ignoramus," she exclaimed in desperation. On the advice of the *curé* she was sent home, early in 1858, that she might be properly instructed.[24]

Having returned home steps were seriously taken to prepare her for her first communion. She had not been at home two weeks before something remarkable happened. It seems indeed that, while away from her home, exercising the calling of shepherdess, the *curé* who had discovered her lack of spiritual education already had a presentiment that something was about to happen. She made him think, each time he saw her, of some other shepherdesses, to whom the Virgin had appeared, but with not altogether approved results.[25]

Toward dusk, in the early days of February, two sisters, one of them Bernadette Soubirous, with a third, the child of a neighbor, went off to fetch some wood. They sought it in the meadow, along the stream, where the proprietor had been cutting, and might have missed some morsels of brush. Bernadette was timorous about the adventure, fearing she might be caught as a thief. The other two had run ahead of her, and reached a cave on the farther bank—a very shallow cave, but where the shadows soon grew gray and murky. The other two quickly shed their sabots and crossed the shallow pebbly stream. Bernadette lingered, afraid to cross. On the other side one of the girls cried out that her feet were cold from the water. This frightened Bernadette still more, sure that, should she wade across, her asthma would catch her with a painful crisis. The others, gathering sticks as they went, passed out of sight. Still more afraid to stay alone than to cross she began to remove her stockings. She heard a noise, turning saw a bush move in an indenture of the rock, near the cave opening above her head. A little later, after a thin cloud of golden mist had escaped from the back of the cave, she saw "a lady, young and beautiful, above all beautiful," such as she never before had seen, in the rock indenture, above the bush that had moved. The lady smiled, made signs to her to come nearer, and all her fear seemed to evaporate. She began to tell her beads, and her companions, now awaiting her across the stream, wondered at her pious action that particular moment, teased her about it, and now unthinking she crossed the stream, finding the water, not at all cold as she had expected.[26]

---

[22] *Ibid.*, 20-21.

[23] *Ibid.*, 25.

[24] It appears (*ibid.*, 28) that this priest was about to leave for a monastic retreat, and that he himself had already begun her instruction.

[25] "Assurement, si la Sainte Vierge est apparue à ces enfants (de la Salette) ils doivent être simples, bons et piux comme Bernedette. . . . J'ignore ce que passe en moi, mais toutes les fois qu je recontre cette enfant, il me semble apercevoir les bergers de la Salette," De Bonnefon, 119-120.

At home she told the story. Her father, already stretched out in bed, called at her, "You are beginning to talk nonsense. Don't go again to that cave—I forbid it."

But Bernadette went again, many times—eighteen in all. The crowd that followed her when she went grew and grew in number, despite the fact that no one except Bernadette ever saw the Virgin in all these visits of hers. One day the apparition said to her, "I am the Immaculate Conception," proving that, when this doctrine had been definitely declared four years earlier, Pius IX had been more right than Thomas Aquinas.

[26] "Chaude comme de l'eau de vaiselle."

And then, when no longer the Virgin appeared to Bernadette, people continued to come, in ever larger numbers, to see the place where Bernadette had seen the Virgin. It was like a modern fairy story—a very modern fairy story, because hotels began to be built, to take care of the people who came to see the place where Bernadette had seen the Virgin. Nor was that all: there was a tiny springlet in the cave, and the springlet grew and grew, until its water gushed in a stream; and then, as part of the modern part of the story, the water was carried in pipes to hydrants, and ran out into bottles people filled, and it cured people who drank it of all sorts of ailments. It even cured people if tablets were mixed with the water and sent far away through the mail.

Nor was even this all the magic of the story. A great church was built above the grotto, on top of another cryptlike church; and booths were built, to sell bottles with the water in them, and postcard pictures of Bernadette, of the church, of the cave, and the hydrants, and even the hotels.

And in the midst of all this Bernadette, who was never very strong, was taken away to live with some good nuns far away at Nevers. And after that it does not appear that anyone ever saw her again except the good nuns, save once, when her brother crossed a large part of France to see how she was, and after considerable difficulty saw her for almost two minutes, during which all she said to him was, "The Fathers will give you work . . . They will, they have promised me." And so they did, for they gave him a booth, in which he sold water from the spring, and picture postcards of his sister, and chaplets and such things, which was far better than being the son of a miller who had lost his mill.

# SOME CONCLUSIONS

# CONCLUSION

Were one aspiring to write the history of Christianity he would be obliged, in the nineteenth century, to examine many cross sections of thought and of religious experience neglected in the foregoing pages; and this variety was to grow, in a development of religious movements and of religious sects, some of which definitely sought inspiration outside the Christian tradition, while others, preferring still to pass as Christian, attempted reinterpretations which departed more or less widely from the historical development of that religion.

At the beginning of the last quarter of the nineteenth century, however, the Christianity of Christendom, in its overwhelming mass, was still divided between Roman Catholics and Protestants of one or another state church.

The Roman Church had definitely decided its attitude in the situation which had arisen. A religious organization could hardly have more clearly declared its determination to stand in opposition to the rôle now given by Christendom to its Christianity. Its pope chose to remain a voluntary prisoner in a Rome which he no longer ruled as its temporal lord. However, this attitude represented, at its best, something more and broader than a mere protest against having been stripped of a temporal sovereignty. The real battle for temporal sovereignty of any significant importance had long since been lost. Little was left to fight for, as early as Pius VII, in retaining its rule over the papal states, than the independent control of an income by the papacy, derived in feudal manner from these states. The papacy refused to become the pensioner of any state or monarch. Pius VII refused Napoleon's offer of a pension, to reimburse him for the loss of his feudal revenues, Pius IX refused all similar offers from the Italian kingdom which took over Rome as its capital. This refusal, however, did not extend to the

Church entire, which continued generally, in states of Catholic allegiance, to receive state support; and which was later, in France most prominently, to fight determinedly there, both the complete separation of Church and State, and the taking over by the latter of by far the largest proportion of the remaining ecclesiastical property in France.

This fight to be economically free in a Christendom the organized civil existence of which it was no longer able to shape authoritatively was by no means clear cut. Incomes are incomes, whatever their source, and human beings, whether or not of sanctified hands, have a way of grasping them. But it is none the less fairest on the whole to view even the economic aspects of this struggle as part of the more comprehensive program in which the Roman Church clove itself free from the intellectual conceptions which were coming to direct the effective energy of Christendom.

This struggle, a complicated one for an institution which had so intimately grown into the corporate activities of European society, is the one most significant phase of development in the Roman Church of the later nineteenth century. Its significant gestures announced in no uncertain terms the refusal of the religious organism of most unbroken European history to move in the direction in which Christendom appeared to it to be moving.

Here was something more than the program finally organized in the Council of Trent and its immediately succeeding years. Then it had been the mere question of drawing a clear line, from the side of the Roman Church, in a divided Christendom. Here, however, the whole course of history since that division was assessed, and the Church did not so much divide Catholics from Protestants as the Church from the world in which it lived. Then it had aimed to separate its flock, clergy and laity alike, from an alien portion of Christendom. Here it drew its clergy to itself, and split the life of its laity in two. Here the seventeenth-century straddle became a grim reality. One no longer might hope to live at the same time an "altogether spiritual life, altogether in the world." One was hardly longer asked, if he were a layman, to do better than ride the two horses alternatively. The motivation of the secular life was scarcely touched, so far as the overwhelming mass was concerned. The Church continued to thunder condemnations in support of moral formulas hardly more important or near to the essential formative forces of the age than the Protestant formula of sabbath observance. It set itself aside, and ceased to be, though not itself recognizing perhaps this cessation, of the Christianity of Christendom. It declared that it would not go with Christendom, and for its part Christendom very evidently showed no intention to go with it.

In compensation it did something else: set itself aside from life as a refuge, an occasional retreat, where one escaped the noisy currents of life which thick walls of masonry in large part shut out. One stepped across the threshold of its sacred edifices to renew the vision of another life, which its sacraments not only suggested, but were believed to guarantee. This function no longer had anything to do with Christendom. Such a church existed, in reality, but for those who chose to use the refuge, the suggestion, or the promise which it offered.

Here was both a great rôle and a modest one. But, on the other hand, there remained the memory, the symbols, the specters of more expanded prerogatives. And with these memories, symbols, and specters of now greatly diminished prerogatives this organization chose to clothe itself, conditioning the refuge and comfort and promise that it offered with the acceptance of all that had once grown about its different rôle in Christendom. Whatever it had gained, in offering, by its refusal to go further with Christendom—a breathing spell at least, perhaps even at times a fulcrum upon which some effort might raise itself a trifle in habitual attitude—it appeared often to expend, more than in any other way, in its own defense; aiming to keep alive the memory of a time when it had been mighty in Christendom, and to retain tenaciously whatever it might of its departed glory. It appeared to choose above everything to insist that Christianity was, in its only legitimate form, that Christianity of Christendom which had given to the Roman Church its most extended power. It chose to stand, substantially, in the Middle Ages, with an apparent fear that, to lose all that was left it of those Middle Ages, would be to lose everything of substance that it still possessed.

Perhaps it is well this much to explain its attitude; that, first, frightened by the disturbing results of the Reformation, and later noting what had happened to religious authority where the reform movement had become dominant, it assumed that the preservation of its most legitimate values was dependent upon its assumption of old-time authority, and that the preservation of such authority was bound up in a system which the development of centuries had fitted together with a rather close logic of consistency. This possibility, however, we need not here discuss, since it does not belong to the interpretation of history. Let us rather turn to view in brief summary something of the situation of Protestantism, in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and the general direction in which it appeared to be headed.

Protestantism had, in its development subsequent to the Reformation, gone in two different directions, both of which were, however, in a large measure gathered together. It had, on the one hand, given a religious basis to the growing nationalism, on the other, served largely as the religion of the middle class which pushed forward from the sixteenth century to gather in gradually the substantialities of political power, and to spread its values more and more largely throughout the various social strata.

This middle class is primarily defined by the name which designates them in some languages other than English. When first noted as a class of distinctive type and particular interests they were called in French the *bourgeois,* in German the *Bürgher,* that is the *city folk.* But at bottom the class name did not arise merely because they lived in cities predominantly, but because, as cities grew in importance, this importance was based upon the particular economic function of cities. Cities, in the simpler economy of their early growth in modern times, acted less as producers than as instruments of exchange. Products were collected in cities to be distributed to consumers, and the city folk acted as intermediaries.

This type of existence creates a certain sort of virtues, which may be delineated, first by contrast with the two classes which preceded them in the simpler medieval economy. In the latter there were, in general, but farmers and landlords. The former divided their produce with the latter. Purchased articles were relatively few, and there were relatively few persons engaged in the process of exchange. The virtue required of the farmer was, above everything, patient persistent toil. Planting and harvest lay far apart, and the interval was filled by many factors which he could not, with all his trying, control. But, let him relax his labor at an important moment, and, though perhaps but months later, he was certain to suffer. He worked and lived in a long cycle, in which there was no outwitting nature, though nature might, and often did, outwit the best he might do. It might indeed seem, as the Middle Ages most often imaged such labor, that it was an enjoined duty, or perhaps a curse. One labored because one must, never sure of the result, in blind hope.

On the other side was the landlord. Even less than the peasant or farmer was it possible for him to connect directly his income with any particular service he rendered. Misuse of his opportunities was by no means certain to bring any immediately recognized consequence of discomfort or suffering, his highest conscientiousness might hardly look to mirror itself appreciatively in any increased material enjoyment. His most immediate source of satisfaction in his actions was his self-respect; the only guide which could hope very securely to control him was an ideal code of honor.

But the landlord was not merely, hardly considered himself at all, a landlord. He was, first of all a warrior. This settled other things in his pattern of being. As a warrior all his important acts were at the risk, not only of his life, but very possibly of his property entire, and the safety of his wife and family as well. He was continually risking everything on the issue of a single struggle, into which entered, not his prowess only, but many factors of chance which he had no means of controlling.

Without going further into the circumstances, is it so difficult to imagine how a world of such warrior-landlords and such peasants might have erected a religion as the center of their social structure?

But, when one turns to review the forces which set the pattern of conduct of the city man, he finds circumstances altogether different. Trade is a matter of a multitude of individually insignificant transactions, each of which, however, brings an almost immediate proof as to its success or failure. A succession of mistakes spells defeat, and fatal defeat if these mistakes spring from a settled habit. But there is much room for trial and error, with almost immediate checking up, so that the gaining of profitable habits only fails from lack of intelligent use of errors, or from slant of character which opposes the formation of habits of the profitable sort. Income and intelligent effort are almost immediately connected. Further effort of frugality makes possible the accumulation of stock, transactions upon a larger scale, with increasing profits if the old habits successful in the past continue to serve as well. Success and failure is not a *big throw,* but a *broad average.* One's success or failure seems to rest, first of all, in oneself; accumulated experience and reactions of judgment, the stability of the habits formed.

Then too there is a social factor. First there is a social moral factor. One's regularity of habits is not only directly serviceable, but it creates in others favorable expectations. So trade becomes *custom,* and those with whom one trades habitually and repeatedly become *customers,* each side in a transaction having learned to expect in the other such types of behavior as are likely to cause their own side of the transaction to eventuate in the way they wish. So self-interest creates *rules* even in the game of competitive trade. In a life and death battle, a stroke out of order may win the battle—the warriors need codes of honor to protect against this. But where success lies not in one, but in a hundred strokes, one out of order, even where it wins, may destroy the opportunity of the other ninety-nine, or a proportion of them. *Honesty is the best policy,* when the stakes in a single transaction are so small that a doubt as to how one may act the next time destroys more than a single irregular act may hope to gain. But business habits are not all that count. Certain leisure habits make for frugality and solvency, others tempt expenditures which may suddenly put the person at the other end of a transaction in which you are engaged with him in a situation such as to strain his habitual actions. A stable family life suggests stable habits in leisure hours. Reputation is a business asset, and a city man has spies all about him. Here again, the city man may feel his success or failure as resting in certain regular habits which he possesses.

But there is still another social factor—the factor of general social stability. In general, the success or failure of the city man, in so far as he does not feel it to rest in himself, looks to the continuance of the social pattern to which his habits and efforts and assets are adjusted. For the few who, by some happy chance, may profit by some sudden unexpected change, many must suffer. And so, in general, the city man wants peace, and an orderly social environment. With peace the warrior has nothing to do but hunt animals, or arrange mock battles and tournaments. As for the peasant, even in peace his future is not assured, since a drought can as easily ruin him as a foray. Then too, the peasant was at periods a warrior, and might find not only enjoyment but profit of spoils in the adventure. But the city man fights only if he must, to preserve the peace he desires, or secure it, or for the preservation of himself, his family, or his property.

Now, to turn for a moment this psyche of the city man toward the drama of Christendom and its Christianity, what is such a man most likely to want, in the mass, from a religion? He wants, first of all, his habits, which are his primary assets, blessed by any religion which hopes for his allegiance. Next, he wants similar habits blessed in other people, and enforced by the sanction of religion, for two reasons. First he wants them blessed, and wants them not only blessed but enforced, because a code of habits which he has adopted and practices himself is a code that he understands. And when he deals with others under the protection of such a code his risks are reduced, because of his ability to count on certain personal factors involved. Second, he wants this sort of habits blessed religiously and approved socially, because, among his sources of profit are the missteps of others, and whatever condemns such missteps pronounces its blessing over him in taking advantage of them to his benefit.

Finally, he wants peace and social order; the continuance of a social economic pattern to which his habits and organized efforts and machinery are already adapted. To be sure a varying proportion of the profits of trade and finance are assigned as compensation for the taking of a risk (which every social or economic change involves); but if the risk taken and paid for may be subsequently minimized or eliminated, the long average profit will be by so much the greater.

A religion which could help to afford, by the encouragement of its sanctions, an orderly social background, in which settled appropriate habits gained their daily reward, was of practical utility to the city man. He needed but faith in himself and confidence in the stability of his environment.

And if now we turn to the inspiration of the Protestant movement, we discover that, appropriately interpreted, the gospel of Luther, as modified and emphasized particularly by Calvin, appeared to provide for the bourgeois just the sort of religion he might feel desirable. Luther gave the individual (particularly where the evangelical sense of personal dependence upon God weakened) a new religious basis of confidence in himself. Calvin's doctrine of election went considerably farther. But this was not all. Whereas the medieval Church had made generous provision for the pardoning of sin after it had been committed, Protestantism took very shortly to frightening people away from sinful acts, concentrating upon their arresting before the act had taken place. In social effect this seemed to be an improvement, particularly an improvement over conditions where pardons were bought and sold. In individual psychology the twentieth century is not so certain as to the improvement, inclined rather to believe that a mistaken experiment, recognized in penitence as such, is often, so far as the moral and psychological health of the individual is concerned, worth a dozen prohibited impulses arrested.

Of the vagaries of the individual psychology, however, the city man, interested, so far as human beings were concerned, above all in the substantializing of a reliable and regular social pattern, took little account. To take account of such things might seem indeed to encourage them, and he was doubtless not far wrong in believing the pattern he aimed to establish a reasonable pattern, to which the *average man* could adapt himself with no dangerous strain on anything of importance; and the average man was his most reliable stand-by. This fact was clearly recognized in a philosophical way early in the nineteenth century.

> An individual who sums up in himself, in a given epoch, all the qualities of the average man, represents at once everything that there is (in the period) of the great, the admirable (*de beau*) and the good.[1]

Gradually, however, as the nineteenth century advanced, it became more and more evident that the average man, who in this admirable way represented his period, was so likely to find his industry and his regularity rewarded this side of Eternity, that, whatever else Christianity or any other religion might be good for, it was by no means as essential to the preservation of a stable moral pattern of economic society as had been imagined.

And so it began to come about, as Catholicism separated itself from the evolving social and intellectual situation to become a refuge from it, reminding men and women of Eternity under the form of the Middle Ages, that Protestantism, seized upon once with enthusiasm as the religious basis of a new social order, came more and more to be relegated to the rôle of a leisure pursuit of Protestant Christians, in which the more effective energies and interests of the social complex were no longer interested as they had been; and one might scarcely longer look upon Protestant Christianity as a Christianity of Christendom.

For the world moved on. More and more clearly it came to understand and accept the motivation under which it moved, less and less even pretending to trust anything important to other incentive than that of self-interest, and to the growing consciousness of continually complicating, interwoven and interdependent self-interests. When it spoke sincerely it recognized the fact that its sanctions of value, of conduct, of incentive did not rest upon any religious basis whatsoever. Even the pattern of religious piety or regularity came to be of decreasing economic value to the individual, for economic activity tended to become more and more anonymous as it assumed more and more the corporate form. Reputation reposed upon an impersonal entity, a creature of the Law, which corporate entities imposed upon the attention of customers with their arresting bulk and their intrenched organization and vested interests. And these impersonal corporations became the keepers of many individual consciences, for which charge of responsibility they were not in danger of ever being brought before the bar of any divine justice whatsoever.

---

[1] Quetelet, *Sur l'Homme . . .*, a pioneer in the study of social statistics, 1823.

In short, when the last quarter of the nineteenth century entered into its early years, it was already clear to many people that no one's religion need in any way interest anyone else, since it was unlikely to harm, and could hardly assist, anyone save him who chose to cherish it, in some rôle or another, for what promise or consolation he found in it. Christianity was no longer conceived to be a corporate attitude, upon which social organisms counted to further in any very effective way the interests which preserved or which drove them forward.

It is hardly a proper part of our purpose here to consider as to the rôle which Christianity, in whatever institutional form, now had or might have still to play. We have, rather, finished our journey, with Christianity in a position such that, whatever else it was or might be, it no longer interested Christendom to guard or guide it as the Christianity of Christendom.

In those early years, when scattered bands of Christians might fear daily for their lives—so frankly were the ends and aims of their lives disconnected from, if not antagonistic to, the institutions of their social environment—there was no Christianity of Christendom. The situation cannot, at least for long, again be so simple as that. There is a memory, still tangibly incorporated in many forms which last, and from which the memory is with difficulty to be disengaged. We can hardly yet know, and in a century may not yet be certain, as to just when the drama of Christendom and its Christianity was really finished. But, in the light of this impossibility of judging at this time, the historian, fearing already to have trespassed beyond the boundaries of his task, must abandon it to the reader's indulgent patience and at his service.

# INDEX

abbot, 377
Abelard, 419, 428, 438ff., 449
Acts (*see* Bible)
Adam, 422, 611, 669, 831, 894, 998, 1000, 1017
Adams, Henry, 400
Æsculapion, 22
Æsculapius, 22
Agnani, 534
agnosticism, 1019f.
agriculture, 402, 425
à Kempis, Thomas, 35, 481
Alaric, 302
Alba, Duke of, 687
Alberich, 353
Albertus Magnus, 516
Albi, Bishop of, 445
Albigensian Crusade, 441ff., 449, 450, 504
alchemists, 524, 878f.
Alcuin, 343, 346
Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, 212f., 260
Alexander Severus, 188, 268
Alexander the Great, 31, 57, 61, 113
Alexandria, 159
Amadis of Gaul, 744
Ambrose of Milan, 249, 274, 296, 390
Amiens Cathedral, 450, 564
Ammonius Saccus, 159
Anabaptists, 646, 785
ancient civilization, 3, 55
Angélique (*see* Arnauld)
angels, 162
Anselm, 420, 436ff., 456
Anthimus, 310
Anthony, St., 166, 276, 564
Antioch, 118
Anubis, 64
Aphrodite, 21, 25
Apocalypse (*see* Bible: Revelations); The Little, 107
Apollinarius, Sidonius, 292n.
Apollo, 25
Apostolic Fathers, 134
Aquinas, Thomas, 454ff., 475, 554
Arabs, 402 (*also* Mahomet)
Arians, 212ff., 234, 259, 270, 291, 293, 319
Arimathea, Joseph of, 344
Aristides, 151n.
Aristotle, 28n., 31, 50, 396, 435f., 523, 526, 527, 556
Arius, 212ff.
Arles, 269, 270, 304
Arminians, 836
Arnauld, Antoine, 895, 902; La Mère Angélique, 897ff.
Arnold, Matthew, 1007f.
Arnold of Brescia, 432
Arnulf, 335
Artemis, 25
Arthur, Prince, 701f.
Arval brotherhood, 63
Ascension, 100
asceticism, 160, 165ff.
Assisi, 484 (*see also* Francis of Assisi)
astrology, 64, 525, 569
Athena, 38
Athanasianism, 234, 291, 293
Athanasius, 214, 216, 234, 260, 276
Atonement, 53, 164
Attis, 264, 265
*Aucassin and Nicolette,* 468
*aufklärung* (Enlightenment, Age of Reason), 995
Augsburg, Diet of, 649ff.
Augustine, of Hippo, 24, 231, 235, 240ff., 274, 325, 390, 396, 397, 442, 526, 556; of Britain, 320, 325
Augustian Friars, 624
Augustus, 14, 16, 56, 189, 192
Aurelian, 191
Austremonius, 268
average man, 1069
Avignon Papacy, 535ff.

Baal, 63
Babylonian Captivity, Hebrew, 46; of Church, 532ff.
Bacon, Francis, 589, 879
Bacon, Roger, 524, 527
Baldwin of Flanders, 416
Baptism, 129, 161, 546
Baptists, 647
Barbarossa (*see* Holy Roman Emperors)
Basine, 299
Bastard of Savoy, 674
Bastille, 936
*Beatitudes, The,* 79ff.
Bede, The Venerable, 343ff.
Beelzebub, 77

Beghards, 540
Beguines, 540
Bellarmine, 1036
Bellona, 63
Benedict, St., 282ff., 477, 790
Benedictine Order and Rule, 275, 282ff., 469, 477, 583, 748
benefices, 324, 356
Beranger of Tours, 436
Berkeley, Bishop, 967
Bernadette Soubirous, 1055ff.
Bernard Gui, 513, 545, 555
Bernard of Clairvaux, St., 47, 394, 399, 414, 419, 420, 426ff., 438, 440, 444, 535, 550, 609
Bernardino of Siena, 557n.
Bèze, Théodore de, 661, 678
Béziers, 446, 774 (*see also* under Councils)
Bible, The, 163, 592, 594, 625, 652, 720, 757, 861, 993; Gospels, 71, 134, 155, 1006; New Testament, 27, 462, 463, 476, 667; Matthew (First Gospel), 103, 104, 107, 124, 241, 1002; Mark (Second Gospel), 99, 103, 124, 1003, 1004; Luke (Third Gospel), 103, 124, 1003, 1004; John (Fourth Gospel), 6, 40, 99, 103, 130ff., 179, 1005; Acts, 112, 114; Romans, 625ff., I Corinthians, 154, 245; Galatians, 245; Philippians, 120; I Thessalonians, 245; Philemon, 120; Revelations (or Apocalypse), 237, 540; Old Testament, 43ff., 162, 462, 463, 476, 667; Genesis, 7, 242; Deuteronomy, 23; Job, 50, 51, 157; Psalms, 48, 51; Proverbs, 7; Song of Solomon, 47; Isaiah, 82; Daniel, 237, 1034; Hosea, 44, 49; Joel, 109; Amos, 44; Zecharia, 55; Malachi, 88
*Bible of the Poor, The,* 606
Biblical criticism, 90, 995ff., 1030
bishops, 146ff., 248, 292, 297ff., 325, 330, 350, 364, 378f.
Black Death, 540f.
Blandine, 266
Bobadilla, 812, 813
Bobbio, 368
Boccaccio, 569
body, 116, 124ff., 138, 165, 829, 837
Boehme, Jacob, 863, 970
Bohemia (artistic), 961; (*see* Huss, and Hussites)
Boleyn (or Bullen), Anne, 704ff.
Bolingbroke, 922, 924, 968
Bona, Cardinal, 850n.
Bonaventura, 498, 499, 501, 850
Boniface, 331, 335, 345
Book of Common Prayer (Anglican), 723, 726, 732f.
Borgia, Rodrigo (*see* Pope, Alexander VI); Cæsar, 571, 584n.
Bossuet, 843
Bourbons, 682ff., 914, 933
*bourgeois,* 562
Branceleone, 531
Brethren of the Free Spirit, 540
Browning, Robert, 987ff.
Brownists, 864
Bruno, Giordano, 597, 784, 827n.
Buddhism, 12
Bulgarians, 364
*Bundschuh,* 643
Bunyan, John, 864, 871ff.
*burghers,* 600f., 609
Burgundians, 290, 292
Burnet, Bishop, 702

Cædmon, 346
Caliban, 928
Caligula, 264
Calvin, Jean, 579, 663ff., 785
Calvinism and Calvinists, 680, 681f., 727, 788, 836, 841, 890, 916
Canasius, 808, 812
*Candide,* 835
canon law, 185f.
canons, 279
*Capitulaires,* 338
Carcassonne, 446
Carlyle, Thomas, 1010, 1011, 1015
Carmelites, 791ff., 797, 848
Carnival, 547
Carthusians, 425
Cassian, John, 279
Castiglione, 583, 676
catechumanate, 161
*Cathari,* 442, 486
Catherine de Medici, 584, 682, 685ff., 694, 819
Catherine of Aragon, 701ff.
Cato, 17
celibacy, 174, 354, 357ff.
Cellini, 583
Cellites, 540
Cemetery of the Innocents, 567
Ceres, 14, 15
*Chanson de Roland,* 333, 410
charity, 845
Charity, Sisters of, 855
Charlemagne, 11, 333ff., 348, 350, 364, 384, 392, 419
Charles the Bold, 785
Charles the Hammer (Martel), 324, 325, 335, 392
Chartres, 400, 462

Chateaubriand, 946ff., 958, 965
Chaucer, 528
Chénier, André, 940
Childeric, 288
chivalry, 402ff., 471
Chopin, 960
Christ, The, 121-23 (*see also* Messiah)
*Christiade* (*see* Vida)
Church, 7, 136ff., 151ff., 187, 205ff., 211, 248, 254, 401, 404, 408, 418, 529, 549f., 553, 619, 630, 635, 672, 737, 764, 837f., 862, 1039ff.; State, 325, 338ff., 384, 717
Cicero, 62, 250
Cistercians, 399, 419, 425ff., 450, 470
*City of God,* 244, 253ff., 567ff.
Civil Constitution of the Clergy, 937ff.
Clarissas, 496n.
Claudius, 261
Clotilda, 300
Clovis, 299ff., 319
Cluny, 377ff., 424, 450
Coeur, Jacques, 609
Colet, John, 699
Coligny, Admiral, 687f.
College of the Germans, 813
Collins, 927n.
Cologne, 459
Colonna, Vittoria, 806f.
Columba, 345, 347
Columbus, Christopher, 561
Commodus, 187
communion, 42, 127, 147, 727
Company of Jesus (*see* Jesuits)
Comte, Auguste, 1014ff.
concordats, 11, 677, 680, 944ff.
Condé, Prince de, 683, 684, 686, 687
Condorcet, 1017
condottieri, 584
*Confessio Amantis* (*see* Gower)
Confession, of Augsburg, 650, 860f; of Westminster, 866
Congress of Vienna, 953, 954, 964, 992
Conrad (*see* Holy Roman Emperors)
Conrad of Marburg, 514
Constantine, 11, 195, 200ff., 213, 222, 230, 238, 259, 326, 577
Constantius, 230, 270
Constantius Chlorus, 194
conversion (*see* Benedictine Order, and Calvin)
Coton, 848
Councils and Synods of Church, 185; Arles, 269, 270; Beziers, 270; Chalcydon, 305; Constance, 558ff., 756, 763; Constantinople, 304; Elvira, 186; Lateran (Fourth), 518ff., 531; Lyons, 531; Nicæa, 215ff., 270; Pisa, 558; Toledo, 182; Trent, 691, 745, 752ff., 818, 892
Counter Reformation, 740ff., 818f., 854
Courier, P.-L., 983f.
Covenant, Solemn League and, 869
covenants, 43
Cranmer, Thomas, 706, 709
creed, 133, 196ff., 216, 453, 859ff.
Cromwell, Oliver, 732, 916
Crucifixion, 45, 96, 97, 126
Crusades, 409ff., 418, 430, 432
Cudworth, 918
Cupid and Psyche, 128
cycle, seasonal, 17; vegetation, 17ff., 21, 36
Cynics, 33
Cyprian, 152f.

d'Albret, Jeanne, 684
Damiani, Peter, 364, 367, 371ff., 467, 474, 541, 798, 803, 884
Daniel (*see* Bible, Books of)
Dante, 243, 453, 486, 577, 852
d'Arc, Jeanne, 889
Darwin, Charles, 1019
David, family of, 45
de Coulanges, Fustel, 16
de Gonzague, Marie, 900
de Guise (*see* Guises)
de Joinville, 452, 453, 493
de Lamennais, 952, 1011
de l'Hôpital, 685
de Longueville, 904
de Maintenon, 902f.
de Maistre, 953n., 955ff.
de Medici, Catherine, 584, 682, 685ff., 694, 819
de Montfort, Simon, 446ff.
de Pombal, Marquis, 932f.
de Pompadour, Madame, 933
de Rais, Gilles, 889
de Retz, Cardinal, 903
de Saint-Simon, 1014
de Sales, François, 277, 800, 849ff., 854, 884, 893
de Torquemada, Thomas, 779
Dea Cælestis, 64
deaconess, 172
Deacon Paris, 915
deacon, 146, 172
Decius, 395
*Decretals of Isidore,* 349, 380
Deism, 923
Delphi, 64
Demandolx, Madeleine, 887ff.
Demeter, 36ff.
demons, 556

Descartes, 827ff., 917
*Deutsch Theologia, Ein,* 628
Devil, 273, 365, 370, 393, 415, 552, 555, 556, 624, 639, 672, 847, 871, 881f.
*Dictatus Papae,* 383
Diderot, 925, 926, 929
Diocletian, 187, 188, 189ff., 395
Dion Chrysostom, 60n.
Dionysius the Areopagite, 262, 294
Dionysos, 38
disciples, 85
Dispersion, The, 46
divination, 23ff., 64, 290
*divine right of kings,* 195, 916ff.
docetism, 154f., 163, 180
Dominic, St., 515ff.
Dominican Order and Rule, 497, 515ff., 557, 611, 758, 761, 893
*Donation of Constantine,* 326, 530, 577
Donatists, 270
Don Quixote, 741, 742, 744, 788
Dort, Synod of, 786
druids, 261f.
Dürer, Albrecht, 640, 653

Eckehart, Meister, 479ff., 790
Edict, of Milan, 200ff.; of Nantes, 694, 844
Einhart, 341ff.
elders, 146
*elect,* 52
election, doctrine of, 669ff., 675, 865f., 927, 932, 1021
Electors (Kurfürsten), 599f., 639
Eleusinian Mysteries (*see* Mysteries)
Emperors, Cult of (*see* Imperial Cult); Germanic (*see* Holy Roman Emperors); Roman (*see* under individual names)
England, Monarch (*see* under Kings)
Epictetus, 34ff., 60, 906, 907
Erasmus, 593ff., 608, 699, 785
Erastianism, 844, 864f.
Erfurt, 623f.
Erigena, John Scotus, 475f., 790
*eternal gospel,* 476, 541f.
eternity, 240
*Ethics* (Aristotle), 31
Eusebius of Cæsarea, 201, 238
evil, problem of, 156ff., 165, 251ff., 545f.-46, 834ff.
evolution, 1016ff.
exorcism, 161, 546

Faber of Staples (Lefevre d'Étaples), 661ff.
Faber, Peter, 811f.
fairies, 295, 552
*faith,* 132, 176, 177, 1009
Falkland, 847
family, religion of, 16
Fathers, Church, 248, 1031 (*see* Apostolic Fathers)
*Faust,* 962f., 973f.
Feast of Fools, 548ff.
Ferdinand of Spain, 561, 702, 776
fertility cults (*see* under cycle)
Feudalism, 320ff.
Feuerbach, 1011n.
Fichte, J. G., 975ff., 983
fish (symbol), 128
flagellants and flagellation, 375, 541ff.
Fontaine, Françoise, 883
*Fortune* (the God Chance), 64, 156
Fox, George, 864
Fra Angelico, 11
France, monarchs of (*see* Kings)
Franciscan Rule and Order, 497ff., 557, 611, 748, 758
Francis of Assisi, St., 271, 483ff., 790
Franck, Sebastian, 579
Franks, The, 195, 287, 292, 327ff., 402
Frederick, Elector of Saxony, 638, 640, 642, 650, 651
Frederick the Great of Prussia, 934, 973
Frederick William III of Prussia, 964
French Revolution, The, 360, 932, 935ff., 955f.
*Froschmeuseler, Der,* 657f.
Froude, J. H., 1032
Fuggers, 615f.

Galerius, 201
Galilee, 45
Galileo, 784
Gallia Placidia, 302
Gallicanism, 663, 819, 844, 914, 935, 936f.
Gatien, 268
Gaufridy, Abbé, 885ff.
Gaul, 260ff.
Genealogy of Jesus, 102
Geneva, 673ff., 681, 729, 929
*Genie du christianisme,* 946ff., 958, 965
*genus* and *species,* 434ff., 438
Gerbert, 367ff., 434, 819
Germans, 287ff., 327, 328, 379, 405, 477ff., 562, 577, 597ff.
Gethsemane, 93
Gibbon, 204, 239
gloves and girdles, 469, 535, 600, 857
Gnostics and gnosticism, 159ff.
Goethe, 582, 973 (*see also Faust*)
gold, 531, 602

Golden Age, The, 44, 66, 1019
Golden Fleece, Order of the, 785
*Gomorrah, The Book of* (*see* Damiani)
Gospels (*see* Bible)
Gothic architecture, 450, 457ff., 472, 597, 621, 653
Goths, 289f.
Gower's *Confessio Amantis,* 524
*Grace Abounding* (*see* Bunyan)
Grande Mademoiselle, La, 849, 854
Grandier, Urbain, 885
Great Mother, Cult of, 63, 232, 264ff.
Greek philosophy, 27ff., 116
Gregory of Nyssa, 296
Gregory of Tours, 43, 266f., 272, 288
*Grobianus,* 598n.
Grotius, Hugo, 787
Guelphs and Ghibillines, 486
Gui (*see* Bernard Gui)
Guicciardini, 615, 621, 805
Guise, Charles (Cardinal) de, 682ff.; François de, 683, 686f.; Henri de, 688, 691
Gundobad, 293, 295, 300

Hades, 36
Hadrian, 140f., 264
Hebrew poets, 47ff.
Hegel, 1018
Helena, Empress, 208
Heliogabalus, 191
Henry of Lausanne, 444
Hephaistus, 25
Hera, 25
Heraclitus, 33
Herder, 1018
heresy, 180, 212, 441, 486, 510ff.
Hermes, 25
hermits, 166ff., 274
Herod, 98
Herodotus, 25
Hesiod, 14, 19, 25, 44, 224
Hieron of Epidaurus, 22
Hilary of Poitiers, 270f., 274, 278
Hildebrand (*see* Pope, Gregory VII)
Hobbes, Thomas, 913
Hohenstaufens, 45, 537
Holy Grail, 344
*Holy Living* and *Holy Dying* (*see* Taylor, Jeremy)
Holy Roman Emperors and Empire, 381, 576ff.; Otto I, 354, 379; Otto II, 368; Henry II, 380; Henry III, 380; Henry IV, 386; Conrad III, 414; Frederick I (Barbarossa), 419, 511, 519; Frederick II, 511, 529, 530, 531, 577; Maximilian, 598, 632, 637, 638; Charles V, 599, 638ff., 780, 785; Maximilian II, 814; Rudolph II, 814, 878; Joseph II, 914
Holy Spirit, 183
Homer, 25, 37, 224
House of Commons (England), 711, 732
Huguenots, 686n., 687ff., 693, 844
humanism, 580, 591, 655
Humanity, religion of, 1012ff.
human sacrifice, 38
Humbert, Cardinal, 374
Hume, David, 968ff., 971
humility, 283, 314, 845, 854
*humors,* the four, 526
Hundred Years War, 540, 563
Hungary, 364
Huns, 289, 293, 402, 421
Huss, John, and Hussites, 560f., 592, 603

Iconoclastic Controversy, 390
Ignatius, 142
images, 127, 390
Immaculate Conception, doctrine of, 610ff., 1052
imperial cult, 26, 140, 144, 192f., 261
incantation (*see* magic)
Independents, 869, 870, 916
*Index,* 761, 807
indulgences, 612ff., 618, 629ff., 637
infallability, Doctrine of papal, 1054
infancy narratives, 104ff.
Inquisition, papal, 504ff., 545, 761; Spanish, 775ff.
*Institute of the Christian Religion, The,* 665ff. (*see also* Calvin)
interdict, 449
Irenæus, 266
Isabella, Queen of Spain, 561, 702, 776, 779
*Isidore, Decretals of* (*see Decretals*)
Isis, 64

Jamblichus, 218f., 222
James, William, 281
Jansenism, 844, 892ff., 901, 906, 914, 936, 937
Jansenius (Cornelius Jansen), 787, 892ff., 903
Jehovah, 48ff., 137, 158
Jerome, St., 277, 278, 280, 793, 996
Jerome of Prague, 560
Jesuits, 607, 691, 740ff., 760, 810ff., 839, 840, 893, 932ff.
Jesus, 5, 7, 8, 45, 53, 69ff., 73ff., 134, 154, 312, 317, 397, 491ff., 502, 845
Jetzer, Hans, 611f.

Jews, 5, 43ff., 84f., 98, 110, 134f., 317, 415, 519, 523, 527, 581, 601, 770ff.
Joachim of Flora, 476f.
John of the Cross, 789, 798ff.
John the Baptist, 71ff., 163
Joseph of Arimathea, 344
Jovian, 227
Judaism, 55, 110, 113
Julian, 203, 219ff., 287
Juno, 15
Jupiter, 15 (*see also* Zeus)
Justinian, 308ff., 523
Justin Martyr, 151
Juvenal, 58, 60

Kant, Immanuel, 666, 970ff., 977, 1001
Karlstadt, 641
Keats, John, 948, 960
Kingdom of God (or Heaven), 73, 76, 79, 1013
King Log, 657f.
King Oswald, legend of, 493
Kings and Queens of England: Richard I, 415; John, 536; Edward II, 536; Edward III, 536, 842; Henry II, 444; Henry III, 773; Henry VII, 700, 701; Henry VIII, 700ff., 720, 728, 753, 868; Edward VI, 712ff., 725; Mary, 702f., 705, 713ff., 720; Elizabeth, 619, 708, 714ff., 725ff., 868; James I (also James VI of Scotland), 728, 732, 842f., 865; Charles I, 732, 843, 865f., 868, 878, 913; James II, 840; William and Mary, 913; Victoria, 959
Kings of France (from Capetians): Hugh Capet, 369; Louis VII, 393, 430, 444; Philip August, 415, 445f.; Louis IX (St. Louis), 393, 452, 493, 831; Philip the Fair, 514, 533ff.; Charles VII, 563, 842; Louis XI, 563, 564, 676, 785; Francis I, 579, 638, 639, 676, 680, 703, 753; Henry II, 584, 681ff.; Francis II, 682ff.; Charles IX, 684ff., 820; Henry VIII, 689, 690, 840; Henry IV (also of Navarre), 684, 688ff., 820, 840; Louis XIII, 843, 878; Louis XIV, 821, 843, 902ff., 913, 914; Louis XV, 914; Louis XVI, 936, 937, 939; Napoleon I, 11, 943f., 951ff., 964, 1045ff.; Louis Phillipe, 959, 984; Napoleon III, 1051
kings, divine right of, 841ff.
*king's evil,* 842
Kirk, Robert, 554n.
*kirk, rule of the,* 729ff.
Knipperdolling, 646
Knox, John, 725, 729
Koran (or Quran), The, 316, 523
Krechting, 646

La Bruyère, 853
Langton, Stephan, 392
*lares* and *penates,* 17
Last Judgment, 449, 541
Law, 913, 917; Christian (of heart), 43; Mosaic, 43, 110, 113, 115f., 476
leagues of peace, 408
League, The Catholic (France), 689ff., 819
Leibnitz, 835, 917
Le Jay, 812
Lerins, 280, 344
*Letters of Obscure Men,* 609f.
life-force, 21ff.
Ligugé, 278
Locke, John, 917, 966f.
Logia, The, 1004
*Logos,* 103f., 123, 131, 132, 158
Lollards, 540, 697
Lombard, Peter, 450
Lombards, 290, 325
Lourdes, 1055ff.
Loyola, Ignatius, 737n., 741ff., 790
Lully, Raymond, 827
Lutherans, 712, 788, 836
Luther, Martin, 517, 579, 594, 597, 603, 616, 617ff., 653, 666, 672, 675, 764, 785, 930, 975f.

Machiavelli, 571, 576, 583, 586f., 588ff., 647, 782, 805
*macrocosm* and *microcosm,* 526
magic, 11, 18, 64, 331, 357, 545ff., 552ff., 879
Mahomet and Mohammedanism, 12, 315ff., 522ff., 527, 775, 780
Malebranche, 825n.
manichæism, 243, 250
Marburg Conference, 648
Marchant, Guy, 567ff.
Marcus Aurelius, 34, 64, 187, 264
Margaret of Navarre, 676, 684
Marmoutier, 272, 278
Marot, Clement, 676
Marozia, 352ff.
Marsilius of Padua, 537f.
Martial, 268
Martin of Tours, 271ff., 274f., 278f., 312, 332
martyrs and martyrdom, 141ff., 210, 263f., 389
Mary Magdalene, 92, 852
Mary Stuart (Queen of Scots), 715, 729f.
Mass, the, 18, 357, 457, 472ff., 723

Master of the Sacred Palace, 516
Mausoleum of Hadrian, 352, 353
Maximian, 194f.
Maximin, 200
*mazuco,* 587f.
McCabe, 1040n.
Mechtilde of Magdeburg, 884
Melancthon, Philip, 641f., 650, 653
Melbourne, Lord, 959
Mercury, 14 (*see also* Hermes)
Messiah, 44ff., 51, 85, 86, 91f., 94f., 101, 107f.
middle class, 652, 915, 1066ff. (*see also* bourgeois)
Mirabeau, 926
miracles, 553, 995
Mithra and Mithraism, 64, 190ff., 264
Molière, 854, 904
Molitor, Ulric, 556n.
monarchism, 183ff.
monasticism, 154, 249, 274ff., 358, 380, 391, 450, 470, 617, 730, 809f.
Monica, St., 245
monks, 365, 399, 635, 652, 696
monotheism, 50ff.
Montaigne, 907
Montalembert, 282, 328
Montanus and Montanists, 184
Monte Cassino, 283
Montesquieu, 923, 926, 1017
More, Sir Thomas, 647, 699, 708
Mosaic Law (*see* Law)
Moses, 317, 921, 1001, 1017
Moslem (*see* Mahomet)
Münster (*see* Anabaptists)
Münzer, Thomas, 644f.
mysteries, 36ff., 225f.
Mysticism, 132, 251, 475ff., 789ff., 845f.
mystic way, 801
myth theory, 1002ff.

Neo-Christianity, 940
Neoplatonism, 39, 156ff., 218, 222, 231, 234, 250, 346, 523
Nero, 34, 119, 135f., 191, 395
Newman, John Henry, 1007, 1031ff., 1040
Newton, Sir Isaac, 918
*Nibelungenlied,* 419
Nicene Symbol, 216, 220
*Nichomachean Ethics* (Aristotle) (*see Ethics*)
Nietzsche, 27, 991; 1022
nominalism, 520ff.
non-conformists, 720ff.
Noodt, 913n., 919
Normans, 364, 421, 486
Norsemen, 348ff.
Nuremberg, 600

Odo of Cluny, 377
occasionalism, 830, 832, 846
Olympian Gods, 19, 22, 24ff., 28, 31, 47, 312, 547
oracles, 247
Origen, 159f., 163, 241, 996
Orpheus, 64 (*see also* mysteries)
Osiander, 656
Osiris, 64 (*see also* mysteries)
Ostrogoths, 292
Otfrid, 328
Otto of Bamberg, 405
*Ox, The Fable of the,* 659f.
Oxford Reformers (*see* Colet)
Oxford Reform Movement, 1029ff.

pagan religion (*religio paganorum*), 228
*Palladius, The Paradise of,* 166f.
Palestine, 27
pantheism, 476, 834
*Paradise Lost,* 871
parousia, 107
Parr, Katherine, 712
*Parsifal,* 419
Pascal, Blaise, 666, 895, 902, 905ff.; Jacqueline, 901
Pasquier, Étienne, 679
*pasquinata,* 1043
Passover, 93, 97
Patrick, St., 344
Patripassians, 183
*patrons* and *patronesses,* 27
Paul, Apostle, 6, 33, 36, 40, 45, 63, 110, 112ff., 129, 136, 141, 159, 236, 245, 246, 625, 666, 670, 699
Paul of Narbonne, 268
Peasants' Revolt, 585, 643ff., 841
Pelagians, 280ff., 894f.
Pelagius, 280, 344, 834
Pepin, 325, 336
persecution, 134ff., 141ff., 194f.
Persephone, 37
Perugino, 589
Peter, Apostle, 73, 83, 87, 93, 109, 178, 236, 311, 329
Peter the Hermit, 413
Petrarch, 539ff., 582f., 591, 593
Pharisees and pharisaism, 81, 108
Philip of Hesse, 651
Philip II of Spain, 714, 768, 769, 780ff.
philosophy of religion, 1000
Pierre de Bruys, 440, 443f.
*Piers Ploughman,* 529, 697f.
Pilgrimage of Grace, 711ff.
pilgrimages, 409, 846

*Pippa Passes,* 988ff.
Pisistratus, 11
Plato, 31, 39, 116, 156, 250, 435
Pliny, 64, 136
Plotinus, 250, 251
Pluto, 37
Polybius, 31
Polycarp (saint and martyr), 142ff.
Pontifex Maximus, 15, 202, 229
Pontius Pilate, 95
popery, 726
popes and papacy, 152f., 270, 303ff., 325ff., 351ff., 380ff., 470, 537, 538ff., 570; Pope Sylvester I, 326; Leo I, 153, 303ff.; John I, 307; Gregory I (The Great), 297, 313ff.; Zacharius, 336; Stephen I, 336; Adrian I, 343; Leo III, 337; Nicholas I, 349; Sergius III, 352; John X, 352; John XI, 353; John XII, 354; Sylvester II (*see* Gerbert); Gregory VII, 360, 374, 382ff., 411ff., 418, 485, 531, 561; Urban II, 411, 418, 441; Pascal II, 418; Innocent II, 430, 431; Lucius III, 511; Innocent III, 416, 418, 441, 445, 446, 499, 500, 512, 518, 531, 561; Honorius III, 499; Gregory IX, 543; Innocent IV, 531, 532; Alexander IV, 531, 532; Urban IV, 532; Clement IV, 532; Gregory X, 532; John XXI, 532; Martin IV, 532; Boniface VIII, 533ff.; Clement V, 534f., 539; John XXII, 537, 539; Benedict XII, 539; Clement VI, 541; Benedict XIII, 543; Alexander V, 558; John XXIII, 558f.; Martin V, 559ff.; Nicholas V, 570, 589; Calixtus III, 571; Innocent VIII, 555; Alexander VI, 571, 589, 754; Julius II, 589; Leo X, 589, 590f., 604, 615, 616, 631, 637, 677, 680, 808; Adrian VI, 604, 764; Clement VII, 589, 753; Paul III, 754, 760; Paul IV, 761; Pius IV, 761; Benedict XIV, 915; Clement XIII, 933f.; Clement XIV, 934, 1041ff.; Pius VII, 1045ff., 1054; Leo XII, 1044, 1049; Pius VIII, 1049; Gregory XVI, 1049; Pius IX, 1049ff; 1054; Leo XIII, 1054
Portiuncula (or Porziuncula), 484, 495
Port Royal, 897ff.
Posidonius, 62
Postumus, 268
poverty, 481, 492ff.
*precarium,* 322ff.
preëstablished harmony (*see* Leibnitz)
Premonstratensians, 425
Presbyterians, 866f., 869, 870
presbytresses, 172
Prescott, 781
Priapus, 22
priest, 20, 162, 174
Priscilla and Maximilla (*see* Montanists)
Probus, 269
Procopius, 309
progress, idea of, 999
Prophets (*see* Hebrew Poets)
Protestantism, 11, 52, 1028f.
Protestants, 607, 762, 840, 974
Proudhon, P. J., 986n., 1012f.
psychopathology, 875f.
purgatory, 613, 710
Puritans, 607, 725, 733, 873, 890, 909
Pythagorus, 40

quadrivium, 367
Quetelet (*see* Average Man)
quiet, prayer of, 794

rabbi, 121, 122
Rabelais, 244, 677, 961
Racine, 901
Radbertus, 472ff.
Rapin, 892
Raymond of Toulouse, 445ff.
Realism, 520ff.
Reason, Age of (*see* Aufklärung)
Reason, Cult of, 116, 940ff.
Reformation, 4, 247, 360, 575-733 *passim,* 974
relics, cult of, 209f.
Renaissance, 581ff., 621, 627f., 738, 789, 827, 832, 854, 917, 928, 961, 998
Renan, 1001
Resurrection, 99ff., 125
revolution (*see* French Revolution): of 1688, 913ff.; of 1830, 954; of 1848, 954, 985, 987
Rheims, 368, 369f.
Richelieu, 821, 841, 878, 902
Robespierre, 941ff.
rogations, 295.
Rollenhagen, Georg, 657
*Romance of the Rose, The,* 469
Roman Emperors (*see* individual names); cult of (*see* Imperial Cult)
Roman Law, 56
Roman Peace, 56
Romanesque Art, 421ff., 449, 458, 460, 472, 653
Roman roads, 56
romantic movement, 958ff.
Ronsard, 678ff., 807
Rosecrucians, 879

Rouen Cathedral, 502
Rousseau, J. B., 928n.
Rousseau, J. J., 928ff., 935

sabbath, 73, 76
sabbath-keeping, 730f.
Sachs, Hans, 651, 654f.
sacraments, 162, 723
Sacred Union (*see* League)
sacrifice, 51
St. Alban, 344
St. Barbara, 564
Saint Bartholomew's Eve Massacre, 688
St. Bridgit, 543
St. Christopher, 564
Saint-Cyran, 892, 896, 901
St. Martin of Tours (*see* Martin of Tours)
Sainte-Beuve, 900
Saint-Évremond, 999f.
saints (*see* under individual names)
St. Roch, 564
saints, cult of, 209f., 389ff.
Salonius and Sagitarius, 298f.
salvation, 6, 41, 54, 69, 124, 131, 162, 275, 365, 453, 461, 478, 570, 961, 1008, 1024ff.
Salvian, 249
Saracens, 350, 352, 421
Sarpi, Paolo, 752
Satan (*see* Devil)
*Satire Ménepée,* 692f.
Saturnalia, 547
Saturninus, 268
Savior, 20, 54, 124, 131, 311, 449, 462, 845, 1024
Savonarola, 571
Saxons, 290
Schleiermacher, 981ff.
Schmalkald, League of, 651
scholasticism, 251, 454ff., 475, 520, 581, 766, 894
Schopenhauer, 926n., 1012
schism, 212, 532
science, 1026ff.
Scott, Sir Walter, 960
Scriptures (*see* Bible)
Seneca, 35, 60, 313ff., 664
Severus, Septimius, 188
Severus, Sulpicius, 263n., 272
Shakespeare, 733, 827, 928
Shelley, P. B., 948, 961
Simeon the Stylite, 168
simony, 354ff., 385ff.
*Simplicius Simplicisimus,* 816f.
Sisters of Charity, 855
Skeptics, 33
slaves and slavery, 17, 196ff.
Slavs, 404f., 414
Socrates, 29f., 239
Somerset (Protector of Edward VI), 712
Son of God, 107, 123f.
*Son of Man,* 94, 107, 121, 122, 124
sophists, 29
Sorbonne (*see* University of Paris)
Spencer, Herbert, 1019ff.
Spinoza, 786, 831ff., 917.
Spires, Diet of, 649
*Spiritual Exercises,* 745ff., 847, 848, 884 (*see* Loyola)
*spiritual marriage,* 172, 794, 884
springs, cult of, 22
Stephen, Martyr, 101, 111f., 117
Sterne, Laurence, 925
stigma, 519
*stigmata,* 491, 612
Stilicho, 231, 234
Stoics and Stoicism, 32ff., 50, 63, 114, 116, 159, 225, 894, 906
Strabo, 113
Strauss, D. F., 1002
stylites, 168ff.
*substance* and *attribute,* 436
Suger, Abbé, 426
*Syllabus, The Papal,* 1052ff.
symbols and symbolism, 128, 162, 180, 457, 461
Synods (*see* Councils)

Tacitus, 134, 287, 288, 289, 290, 405
Tacitus, Emperor, 269
Talleyrand, 938
Tarsus, 113f., 116, 118
*Tartuffe* (*see* Molière)
Tauler, 475
Taylor, Jeremy, 856f.
Templars, Knights, 535f.
Temple of Jerusalem, 90ff., 94, 110, 135
Teresa, St., 789, 791ff.
Tertiaries of St. Francis, 501
Tetzel, 615, 616, 630, 631, 637
Thaïs, 173
Thamise, 64
Theatines, 761
Theodora, Empress, 308ff.
Theodora (of Rome), 351ff.
Theodoric, 288, 293, 307
Theodosius, 204
Theses against Indulgences, 629ff., 637
Thirty Years War, 816f., 879, 974
Thomas of Celano, 487
*Three Rings, Tale of,* 519
Thucydides, 30, 224
Titus, 135

Titans, 38
tolerance, 229, 506ff., 825f., 853, 919, 920
Trajan, 136, 264
*transubstantiation,* 473
*treasure of merit,* 612ff., 631.
Trinity, 47, 184f., 439, 456, 480, 551
*trivium,* 367
Trophimus of Arles, 268
troubadours, 407f., 440
*truce of God,* 409
Tübingen School, 1003
Turks, 411, 651
*Two Ways, The,* 130

Ulfilas, 217, 290
Ultramontanes, 819, 940
uniformity of worship, 720ff., 724
*universals,* 521
universities, German, 608f.
University of Paris, 539, 543, 677, 820
usury, 771, 772
*Utopia,* 699
Utopias, 585, 647

Valentinian, 228
Valla, Lorenzo, 593, 594
Vandals, 290
Vaudois, 486, 513
vegetation (*see* cycle)
Veron, 951n., 952
Vespasian, 189
Vestal Virgins, 140, 232f.
*Victorial, Le,* 741, 743
Victory, altar of, 233
Vida's *Christiados,* 589ff.
Vienna (*see* Congress of)
Villon, François, 401, 569
Vincent de Paul, St., 855, 893
Vincent Ferrer, St., 543
Violet le Duc, 451
Virgil, 14, 15, 365, 852
virginity, 170ff.
Virgin Mary, 96, 105f., 305, 311, 373, 389, 397ff., 432, 449, 551, 564ff., 610ff.
*virtu,* 588, 591, 627
Visigoths, 292, 302
Voltaire, 835, 923, 935, 973
Vulgate, 277, 592, 593, 594, 757

Waldensians, 592, 602, 880
Wars of the Roses, 695, 704
wayfarers, 528f.
Wesley, John, 931
widows, 172
Wier, Jean, 876
William of Orange (The Silent), 786
witches and witchcraft, 876ff.
Wolsey, Cardinal, 703ff.
*Word (see Logos)*
World-soul (*Weltgeist*), 158, 159, 973f.
Worms, Diet of, 1521, 649; 1545, 755
Wycliffe, 517, 529, 592, 697, 729

Year 1000, 369f., 376

Zeno, 32ff.
Zeus, 25, 29, 37, 38, 40
Zürich, 660
Zwingli, 648, 659ff., 785

Date Due

Ap 23 '42
FACULTY

BW901 .B67 v.2
The Christian saga,

Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library

1 1012 00015 6523